

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCE.

JULY 1827.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*The History of the Reformation of the Church of England.*
By HENRY SOAMES, M. A. Vols. I. and II. Rivingtons, 1826.

It is not that we have been insensible to the merits of Mr. Soames' work that we have so long neglected to notice it; on the contrary, we are disposed to regard these volumes as a valuable addition to theological literature, and have no hesitation in giving it as our opinion, that they will become a standard work in the well-ordered library of every divinity student. That Mr. Soames has written at great length on what may now be termed a hackneyed subject, must not discourage the inquirer after truths the most important that history can elucidate; to say that he has also written to great purpose, is no mean praise, when we consider the formidable host of contemporary scholars who have advocated the same good cause. Our author (as we will proceed to shew *tout à l'heure*) is not to be classed among the countless pamphleteers who have come forward in answer to a particular charge, or in defence of a particular doctrine. Not that it would have been a slender reputation to a new adventurer in the arena of controversy, to have been numbered among the Townshends, and Philpotts, and Whites, "cum multis aliis," whose pages are sparkling before us; nor, if we mistake not, does Mr. Soames aim at a more distinguished recompence for his literary labours. But we are prepared to award him a higher station,—to receive him as a diligent, and accurate, and faithful historian of a period the most pregnant with troubles; yet, thanks to the glorious Reformation, a period the most fertile of blessing to highly-favoured England of any that preceded it—that period when she emerged from "more than Egyptian darkness," hourly to grow into more perfect day. If it be said, that having access to the valuable works of Burnet and Strype, we needed not the assistance of Mr. Soames' portentous volumes, we would observe, that the latter come more immediately home to the business of the Reformation than either of its predecessors,—that, whereas "the subject of which they treat,"

as Mr. Soames very justly observes in his Preface, "cannot be completely understood without reading their works conjointly, a labour for which the mass of readers have neither time nor inclination;" the same extent of information, the same rich fruits of learned and laborious research, are embodied in this one work, with a reference to authorities, general and particular, such as we have rarely met with in any former publication. The critical reader will not fail to notice this peculiar and prominent merit in the volumes now under consideration. These references, indeed, are so abundant, and so especially bearing upon the controversial portion of the work, that we are well nigh disposed, either to question the correctness of the statement which the author (page xii. of his Preface) introduces as an apology for the "manner in which the work is executed, that he has had no access to books beyond what his own very limited collection has supplied;" or if, as in common courtesy bound, we give him credit for this assertion, we might, perhaps, if admitted behind the scenes, be somewhat at issue with him as to the "*very limited*" character of his library.

In drawing out our analysis of this well-timed and useful history, we will occasionally allude to these references, some of which will be found, we will venture to say, a very singular treat to the critical theologian. The public have of late been so much occupied by reflections on the high controversy so long pending between the Catholic and the Anti-Catholic,—a controversy which, ancient as it is, still retains its interest and importance,—that without indulging in any preliminary remarks, we will proceed at once, and endeavour to reduce our observations into as brief a form as possible, not forgetting, while we consult the patience of the reader, that we have a duty to perform to the voluminous writer.

In an elaborate Introduction to his History of the Reformation, after observing upon the motives which have led to his labours, and his endeavours to "correct the known errors of preceding writers," to "bring scattered facts together, and to illustrate particular subjects," to enable intelligent Englishmen to form an opinion as to how far the reformers laid the foundations of their country's moral, intellectual, and political superiority;" (in which endeavour we think Mr. Soames has abundantly succeeded;) our author proceeds to a brief review of the Roman Christians under the pagan emperors; the importance of their bishops, and the distinguished place they occupied among the Roman aristocracy. The natural consequence of this was, a deep impression on the minds of the provincial Christians, of the "metropolitan prelate's power and station." During the reign of Constantine the government of the Church was modelled according to the civil arrangement of the Roman empire; and it is clearly shewn, that the patriarchal dignity (the title of patriarch, according to Cave's Disser-

tation, being borrowed from the Jews) was an important advantage to a powerful and opulent prelate whose master resided *at a distance*. In 364, the division of the Roman empire between Valentinian and Valens,—in 404, the transfer of the imperial court to Ravenna,—the consequent dominion at Rome of her bishop, the most distinguished of her inhabitants, while the northern barbarians, becoming sensible of his influence, embraced Christianity, and cultivated his friendship, “all these circumstances concurred to consolidate the greatness of the papal see. The strides made under imperial patronage towards an universal primacy, by the patriarchs of Constantinople, served in the end to extend the influence of the Roman bishops. The disputes consequent upon this encroachment led to the appointment of an oecumenical or universal bishop, and drew forth angry invectives from Pelagius and Gregory the great; though the successor to Gregory accepted the title which had been deemed so presumptuous in a rival.” These circumstances are severally mentioned by Mr. Soames, as illustrative of the growing grandeur of the Roman see; and they are severally supported by ample quotations from the *Decline and Fall*, Mosheim, Cave, Faber, and Bingham’s *Christian Antiquities*. We would gladly follow the author through his able Introduction, tracking the progress of papacy through the middle ages, the dark times succeeding those of Charlemagne, until we arrive at the origin of opposition in the eleventh century—an opposition which has continued uninterruptedly to our own days. The interesting allusions, also, to the Waldenses in their Alpine retreats,—the jealousy with which the Church of Rome watched the movements of that venerable community,—the copious notes with which Mr. Soames enriches this part of his *Introduction*, (p. 54—56,)—the passing commentary upon Wickliffe,—the Lollards,—the birth and character of Luther,—and, under his labours, and the blessing of a considerate heaven, the commencing day of Reformation;—these, as they are comparatively commented upon, well deserve a more deliberate notice than we have space to bestow upon them. But we cannot close our remarks on the *Introduction* without recommending the reader’s especial attention to the note (p. 125) upon the “irresistible invectives he (Luther) thundered against the ruinous folly of trusting to papal pardons, as the means of escaping from any thing beyond canonical penances.” Mr. Soames, in this note, quotes largely from Gerdes, Guicciardini, Hume, Bossuet, Milner, Sleidan, Robertson, &c. &c. The effects of the Reformation upon the Romish church, struggling in vain to recover the ground they had lost,—their unchanged political pretensions, still allowed to occupy their ancient places among the authentic documents of the papacy, are remarked upon in a sensible and satisfactory manner by the author.

We now come to the progress of the Reformation under Henry VIII. Mr. Soames argues from the numerous publications for heresy, instituted in the first part of Henry's reign, that the party hostile to the church was extensively spread throughout the country.

At intervals some holy and undaunted spirit was freed from its earthly prison, amidst the horrors of the gloomy pyre; and commonly were seen those, who, not having dared to encounter the agonizing escape from life, had abjured their opinions, were branded on the cheek, and forced to bear about a badge.—P. 158.

The writings and conversation of Erasmus, had, however, contributed not a little to influence the minds of Englishmen; and among those who prepared the way for the Reformation, Dr. John Colet was conspicuous, devoting his ample fortune to the endowment of schools, and the introduction into his cathedral of scholars of unquestionable information.—(*Knight's Life of Colet.*) A note here awards to St. Paul's School the honour of having taken the lead, among places of elementary education, in “solidly preparing the public mind for the Reformation.” Sacred literature now obtained a footing in either university. Among the students at Cambridge, the exemplary Hugh Latimer laid the foundation of his future fame under the reader in divinity, in 1524. Now, also, began the importation of Lutheran books, and a daily growing disposition for the new opinions. The circumstances under which Henry ascended his throne, and his violent and imperious temper, tended to increase the authority of a sovereign but moderately fettered by constitutional restraints: his foreign influence also was greater than had been hitherto known in Europe. Had he been so disposed, he might at a word have altered the national religion; but he was attached to the Roman see, and Wolsey was his counsellor. Both were supporters of Aquinas, the Dominican friar, “*the Angelic Doctor*,” whom Luther, to the great disgust of the monarch and his minister, had attacked in his “*Babylonish Captivity*.” *Per se aut per alium*, Henry replied to Luther, in a Latin treatise upon the “*Seven Sacraments*,” and dedicated to the Pope! So unpromising was the dawn of a reign destined to shed so many and so great blessings upon England. The marriage of Henry with his brother's widow—the unprincipled measures to which he had recourse to dispossess himself of Catherine on his growing passion for Anne Boleyn—the disgrace of Wolsey, and Henry's rupture with the Pope, come not within the province of our review, save as they led to results that materially prospered the work of Reformation in the country. The reader must, however, be cautioned to pay particular attention to the eloquent digression upon Cranmer, “to whose advice and labours Englishmen owe the Reformation of their national church.” Wolsey's disgrace and death gave the first blow to Ro-

manism—one principal opposition to Henry's projected marriage was removed, and the monarch now directed his whole attention to the "beautiful object of his affections." In the meantime, the celebrated *Protest* was given in by certain individuals among the members of the diet at Spire. "This protest was signed by the Elector of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, the Dukes of Brunswick, Lunenburg, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, the Prince of Anhalt, and fourteen imperial cities." Among these celebrated names, a British protestant, observes Mr. Soames, "recognizes with honest pride that of a prince, whose descendants occupy the throne of his native land, so long the home of sound religion, manly intelligence, and rational freedom." Ernest, Duke of Brunswick, attended the lectures of Luther, and "his generous spirit readily imbibed the enlightened views of that great Reformer" (p. 323.) In treating upon the Eucharistic controversy, Mr. Soames makes some valuable comments; and the notes on this subject are, as usual, extremely to the point. It would seem that Cranmer's residence abroad, though it confirmed his alienation from the catholic principles in which he had been reared, fixed him a believer in the doctrine of transubstantiation.

At length, Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn was solemnized, and that with Catherine of Arragon annulled. Cranmer was now Archbishop of Canterbury, and in the chapel of St. Stephen had made his extraordinary Protest, a copy of which is given in a luminous note, (p. 364), in which, in our opinion, the Archbishop is satisfactorily acquitted of the dissimulation with which he has been so unsparingly charged. In the judgment of an impartial posterity, he will not be so readily absolved of the intemperate zeal with which he urged the king's divorce, and accelerated his forbidden marriage,---(p. 388.) Five days were sufficient for the important work of dethroning one queen, marrying and crowning a second, and well nigh christening the princess of the last. Nor do we think that this subservience of justice and morality to policy, should have been passed over in silence by the faithful historian. Mr. Soames styles the young Elizabeth, the "child of the Reformation."

The Pope's authority in England was now abolished, and the foreign authority so long allowed to interfere in her domestic affairs constitutionally disclaimed. The oath was administered to maintain the new order of succession, and, after some hesitation, was taken throughout the country. More refused it, and resigned the seals. Bishop Fisher followed the example of Sir Thomas More. But the fact that courts the attention of the theological reader, and is indeed most interesting to every disciple of Christianity, as the effectual blow to the pretensions of the Romish Church, and a perpetual evidence of its false interpretations, was the translation of the Scriptures.

The reasoning on this event will be found extremely conclusive.—(P. 500 to the end of the volume.) To select a sufficient portion of it to do justice to the author, would swell this article to an undue length.

The outward forms of the Roman worship were, however, still maintained, though the principles of the Papal church had been disclaimed. The complete triumph of the Protestant religion was impeded by the prejudices of the monarch and the artifices of party. Henry manifested great anxiety for reconciliation with Rome, and communicated with the French monarch on the subject. Cranmer's speech on the subject of general councils is given, with a very apposite note to make it appear that St. Peter was never at Rome. Held high in estimation as Cranmer was by the King, important ecclesiastical innovations were anticipated from this declaration of his sentiments. The Archbishop of York, the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Durham, bound themselves to persevere in renouncing the authority of the Pope in England. Mr. Soames here well observes, upon the after conduct of Gardiner and Tunstall, under Queen Mary,—

Nothing can shew more clearly the demoralizing and antichristian operations of Popery than such melancholy examples. Surely no serious and rational man would venture to fly in the face of such an engagement, voluntarily taken, unless he had been deluded into a notion, that there exists a power upon earth competent to absolve men from every obligation however sacred.

The execution of Sir Thomas More, and Bishop Fisher, was followed by the King's excommunication. The hopes that had been indulged in either court of a reconciliation were now completely crushed. On the 30th of August, 1535, the bull was issued,—Henry cited to appear at Rome in ninety days, (see the note on this measure,) and the allegiance of his subjects dissolved. The French King made preparations for invading the excommunicated monarch, and the infatuation of the Papal court urged the King into a line of policy favourable to the cause of reformation. In the same year, Latimer and Shaxton were consecrated, and an *English Primer* published with a patent of privilege. The Romish errors were exposed, and a considerable impression made upon men of intelligence and worth.

The death of Catharine of Arragon, (and her last sufferings are feelingly described,) was followed by a growing distaste on the part of the inconstant Henry for his Queen. This is attributed by some to the levity she displayed on this occasion of Catherine's death,—by others, with greater probability, to his dawning passion (we will not call it *love*) for Jane Seymour. A new and ineffectual effort was made by the French King to negotiate with Henry,—his mode of treating the Pontiff caused his answer to be disregarded, and the negotiation was abruptly broken off. This was followed, however, in the next year,

by an overture from the Pope, who had hopes from the Queen's imprisonment, (for she was now suffering in her turn,) that he might regain his ascendancy over England ;—this overture completely failed ;—and the Pope immediately returned to his favourite measures of intrigue,—sent to the Scottish King a splendid consecrated sword, and endeavoured to engage the cooperation of Francis. A new parliament was now called, and occupied in debates upon the succession ; and an act was eventually passed limiting the succession to the issue of the king's marriage with Jane Seymour, or any future queen,—the former marriages being declared null and void. But this parliament also did much to obliterate all remains of papal authority.

In 1537, the Authorized English Bible was published. We pass over much that is interesting in this interval, to notice the more prominent circumstances that led onwards to the Reformation, having already extended this article much beyond our original intention. The Bible was published under the patronage of Cranmer,—“ Englishmen were thus protected in the exercise of their right to consult the undoubted word of God.” Coverdale, the proto-martyr in the Marian persecution, was the supposed editor. Some part of the translation, our author informs us, was that of Tyndale—probably the New Testament. The royal licence for its circulation was duly recorded in the title page ; and “ no artifice could avail to repress a general desire for the possession of this improved edition of the Sacred Volume.” The hopes of the Protestant party were further confirmed by the birth of a male heir to the crown, though the joy of the nation was much qualified by the death of the Queen. Mr. Soames would fain have us understand that the royal widower participated in the national affliction. Subsequent events too truly tell that his grief was dissembled. He was, however, politic enough to appear outwardly to feel the loss. The name of Edward was given to the young prince ; and Cranmer, Norfolk, and the Lady Mary, were the sponsors on the occasion.

In the late insurrections, occasioned by the suppression of the smaller monasteries, the latter had manifested a most determined hostility towards the government. Reformers reasoned, that so long as monasteries continued, popery could never be extirpated. There is no doubt that Henry had some motive beyond that of prospering the Reformation in awing these rebellious orders into submission. “ He probably had an eye to the replenishing of his exchequer from the confiscation of the conventional property.”—Be this as it may, the work of suppression went on, and the enfeebled state of the monasteries rendered their opposition of none effect. Some curious particulars are given (p. 261), of the credulity of the English regarding these monasteries, for which we regret we cannot afford room. The reader is referred to the note on these contemptible impositions in page 264.

Monachism was completely overthrown; and an annual income, according to Lord Herbert, of 161,100*l.* placed at Henry's disposal. It is no marvel that the sensual Henry was so bent on the dissolution of this order! We cannot forbear from directing the attention of every reader to the beautiful reflections upon the barbarous havoc committed at the dissolution among the splendid triumphs of ancient English architecture. New bishoprics were erected, and thus the influence of the Church in parliament was preserved. It will be readily believed, that the papal court was not pacified by these outrages upon its authority. The rage of the Pontiff knew no bounds. The excommunicating bull was more formally promulgated; but the artful Pontiff mingled with his rage his wonted measures of intrigue. Negotiating with the Kings of France and Scotland, he designated Henry as "a heretic, a schismatic, a manifest adulterer, a public murderer, and a rebel convicted of high treason against the Pope, his Lord." But all this made for the good cause,—men read their Bible more,—clergymen were ordered to teach the Lord's Prayer, the *Creed*, and the Decalogue in *English*, and the people diverted from a reliance upon pilgrimages, relics, counting beads, &c.—In short, an important progress was now made, but not destined to be of long duration; a fickle king soon disconcerted the able measures and untired zeal of Cranmer. The Romanists gained an ascendancy in the royal councils, that not even the union of such men as Cromwell, Latimer, and Shaxton could gainsay. An unfortunate dispute between Cranmer and Shaxton tended greatly to prejudice the cause they had all at heart.

We pass over the interval from this time to the decline of the reforming influence, in 1545, an interval fruitful of cruelty and crime in Henry, of danger and growing dislike to his minister, and consequently of despair to the cause of pure religion. The King was now occupied by a war with France, and the state of foreign politics formed a powerful counterpoise to the influence of the English Reformers. The appointment of a new Chancellor lessened this influence considerably; and the death of Suffolk, a reformer, added to the difficulty. Henry's increasing infirmities gave abundant cause for conjecture to the friends of reformation, as to what might be the fate of the good cause under a new king's dominion, should those sufferings terminate abruptly. He was now again a protestant; the incessant intrigues of the opposing party had thoroughly disgusted him. As the King's death approached, both parties grew anxious in the extreme; but it is a gratifying reflection that Cranmer was with him in his last moments. Nor have we reason to doubt the fact, that he died a confirmed believer in the doctrines of the Reformation.

As to the assertion, that the brightest distinction in Henry's reign was his determined resolution in maintaining the "exclusive right of

God's undoubted word to be the religious instructor of the rational creation;"—that "he delivered England from the evil of monastic institutions;" we go all the way with Mr. Soames; but we question the motives that dictated the support of the first and the suppression of the second. Not even the upholding of so glorious a cause, and the emancipation of his country from the galling thraldom of Popery, must be permitted to atone for his cruel, heartless, and sensual excesses. Mr. Soames' expression is not sufficiently strong, that Henry was "culpable;" his excesses were disgraceful, disgusting, a violation of laws both divine and human, of the God whose faith he defended, of man whose everlasting happiness he affected to be so anxious to secure. His example vitiated his precept; nor can a "good understanding," an "application to business," nor "unimpeached sincerity," "counter-balance" the *more than* "vanity, hastiness, profusion, and sensuality," (how much of crime may be involved in that one word!) "which blemished his memorable career."

Mr. Soames has our best thanks for his valuable work. We repeat our prediction, that he will be classed among our established historians. It is a work that displays extensive reading and considerable research. His heart is evidently in the cause; and his language, always good, and sometimes eloquent, proves that he writes "currente calamo," if the speed with which he prepares his multi-paged volumes did not sufficiently attest that fact. We hope to notice his third volume before the fourth appears.

ART. II.—*A Sermon, preached at Bombay, on Whitsunday, May 22d; at Colombo, September 18th; and at Calcutta, on Advent Sunday, November 27, 1825; in aid of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. By the Right Rev. REGINALD HEBER, D. D. Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Sold by Rivingtons, London.*

The Glory of the Church in its Extension to Heathen Lands. A Sermon, preached in aid of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, at St. George's Church, Madras. By THOMAS ROBINSON, M. A. Domestic Chaplain to the late Lord Bishop of Calcutta. London: Rivingtons, 1827.

EVERY relique of Bishop Heber is precious! and doubly precious, when it has any connexion with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. We, therefore, gladly introduce to the public notice another monument of his zealous attachment to that Institution, which now, we hope, is beginning to occupy a space, in the eye of the English people, somewhat proportioned to the magnitude and sacredness of its designs. Anxious as we are, at all times, to join in claiming for those designs the assistance and the prayers of Christian men, we are, of

course, most signally delighted with an opportunity of repeating the invitation, in the language of departed genius and holiness.

The above Sermon of Bishop Heber has been published, as we learn from a prefixed advertisement, agreeably to a promise made by his Lordship to the several Archidiaconal Committees formed upon its delivery. It was preached at Bombay, at Colombo, and at Calcutta. It was to have been preached at Madras; but the voice which was to give it utterance was silenced for ever by Him who can make either life or death to praise him!

The text is from Acts ii. 38, 39: "The promise is unto you and unto your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call:" and it appears to be the peculiar object of the preacher to impress on his hearers the "diffusive and universal character of the revelation of God's will through his Son, the interest which every nation under heaven possesses in the Christian covenant, and the obligation which rests on every believer to assist and forward, in his station, and according to his ability, the extension of that knowledge, whereby he is himself made wise unto salvation; the communication of those spiritual riches which he himself has received so freely."—P. 2.

After dwelling, for some time, solemnly and impressively on the duty above described, the preacher proceeds to encounter the gainsayers. And the first objection that offers itself comes from a quarter which lowers darkly and angrily upon all exertions for the diffusion of heavenly truth, and discourages the advocates of every such enterprise, by the cold and scornful question, "*What is Truth?*" adding, that "if God were really displeased with the varieties of religious faith which exist among mankind, or if he were really so desirous as we suppose him to be for the universal adoption of any one religious system, he has means in his hand for at once accomplishing his purpose, without waiting for the tardy feet of those agents, whose office it is to bear the good tidings of salvation."—P. 7.

This objection, the Bishop observes, is alike unfortunate in the facts which it assumes, and the arguments which it founds on them. The prophetic Scriptures point, indeed, to the final triumph of the gospel, but never intimate its immediate reception or rapid progress. On the contrary, all the figures employed to illustrate its advancement, indicate very clearly that its march will be slow and painful, and that many generations of offence, of dissension, and even of apostasy, were to intervene before the tabernacle of God could be finally and triumphantly erected. See pp. 8, 9.

But if the progress of truth has been slow, it has not been so tardy as its enemies have represented. According, to the most accurate estimate, those who at present are called by the name of Christ may

be reckoned at 200 millions, or a fourth part of the human race; and within these limits are included the most improved and improving portion of mankind, the most powerful, the most wealthy, and the most intelligent. To them the Old World is immediately or indirectly tributary, while the New World presents to them an almost boundless field for the occupation of a believing posterity. (p. 9—11.) The only legitimate effect, therefore, of the partial dominion of Christianity on the hearts and minds of Christians, should be, not impatience or despondency, but more ardent exertion and more exalted zeal. p. 12.

But, by another class of adversaries it has been urged, that for such exertions we have ample scope at home, and that the almost heathenish condition of many parts of Christendom are a reproach to the waste of our missionary energies on a race with whom we have no concern; a race, too, who may meet the intrusion with resentment and opposition, imminently formidable to the stability of our eastern empire.—P. 18.

Objections of this nature the Bishop shews to be worthless, because, if admitted, they would establish too much. To say that the progress of God's kingdom is to be suspended so long as an unbelieving remnant is to be found in Christian lands, is to maintain a principle which would have confined the Apostles to the first scene of their labours, and intercepted the light of the gospel from the rest of the world. Besides, with what semblance of righteousness or humanity can we shut out from our regards the native millions of Hindostan, by the sweat of whose brow we are enriched, and who are always ready to shed their hearts' blood for our defence and our glory? It is impossible, without indignation, to hear those patient, and brave, and faithful men, otherwise spoken of than as friends and countrymen. England has now made India part of herself; and right dear in her sight should be the souls and bodies of that portion of her people. And then, if we *must* hear of danger, what danger, we ask, is to be apprehended from a system of instruction like that which is now in a steady course of application;

A system (as the Bishop justly observes) studiously distinguished from and unconnected with Government, yet studiously kept within those limits of prudence and moderation which a wise and liberal government has prescribed; a system which, while it offers our faith to the acceptance of the heathen, on the ground of its spiritual blessings, disqualifies no man on account of his contrary opinions from any civil or political advantage; a system which, by the communication of general instruction and general morality, imparts to them a knowledge and feeling, which, whether they become Christians or no, must be highly valuable to them; a system which puts them in fair possession of the evidences of our creed, leaving it to themselves and their own unbiased choice to determine between light and darkness; in such a system, so long as it is steadily adhered to, and patiently and wisely pursued, there is not, there cannot be danger.

They are their own learned men who are our teachers, our correctors of the press, our fellow-labourers in the work of instruction; they are their own countrymen, yea, and they themselves who are benefited by the large expendi-

ture which our system occasions amongst them ; and even our missionaries, as associating with them more, and speaking their language better, and occupying themselves with their concerns, and the promotion of their real or apprehended interests, are, (I have reason to believe, by what I have myself seen and heard in no inconsiderable part of India,) among the most popular Europeans who are to be found in their respective neighbourhoods. Yea more, I have had the happiness of witnessing, both in the number of converts which have already been made in Hindustan, in the general good conduct of those converts, and in the good terms on which they in general appear to live with their gentile neighbours, both how much good may be done, and how little offence will be occasioned by a course of well-meant and well-directed efforts to enlighten the inhabitants of India.—P. 21—23.

To this might be added, what has often been urged with unquestionable truth, that an extended regard for the best interests of the rest of mankind, generally indicates an active spirit of philanthropy and piety at home. And, on the other hand, when the moral and spiritual improvement of our remote dependencies are forgotten, we may reasonably expect a very languid attention to the same great objects in our own country.

The Bishop concludes, by urgently impressing on all faithful members of the English Church this consideration, that on their support and munificence the institutions of that Church have a paramount claim beyond those of any other sect or society ; and this leads to an animated appeal in behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and of Bishop's College, to which that Society is the chief contributor. We hope there are not many hearts prepared to repel a suit which is preferred in such language as the following :

And, as you desire the glory of God, and that the truth of his Son should be made known to every creature under heaven ; as you covet the happiness of mankind, and that innocent blood should be no longer shed amongst us ; as you long for the salvation of souls, and that those who serve and love you here should feel a yet purer and stronger affection for you in Paradise ; as you love your own souls, and would manifest the sincerity of your grateful faith in that Saviour by whom you are redeemed, I exhort, I advise, I entreat, yea, in the name of my master and yours, in the name of Jesus, Son of God Most High, I demand, in this cause, your assistance and your offerings.

The Son of God, indeed, must reign, be the people never so unquiet ! The gospel will finally triumph, let us neglect or oppose it as we may ! But woe be, in that day of God's power, to those who have set themselves against his church's infant weakness ! and woe be to those minor or more timid sinners who have not lent their hand to his harvest ! " Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof, because they went not forth to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty !" But of you, my brethren, I am persuaded better things ; and both as knowing your liberality, and as desiring that your bounty may be made beneficial to your own souls and to those interests which you seek to forward, let me intreat you to devote those good works to God and his Son alone, by a lively faith, by a more excellent repentance, by a fervent prayer—that while you build an ark for others, you may not yourselves be shut forth and perish—and by a participation, let me add, in the blessed body and blood of Him by whose merit alone we obtain, either that our alms-deeds or prayers can be remembered or accepted before his Father.—P. 26—28.

These words close an address in all respects worthy of the apostolic

zeal and exalted talents of Bishop Heber. His faithful servant and friend took up the cause after his decease. The Sermon of Mr. Robinson was delivered in the pulpit, which his master was to have occupied at Madras, and in support of the same institution. "When the Indian Church was deprived of its loved and honoured Prelate, and the Incorporated Society of its powerful and unwearied advocate, the melancholy duty of the last public appeal devolved on his Chaplain." He has discharged that duty in a manner which his lamented Diocesan would have witnessed with pride and delight. He addresses himself, in succession, to all the objections raised up against missionary labours by false friends or avowed enemies; and he powerfully enforces the claims for which, in that very place, the voice of the departed Bishop was to have been raised. We are fearful of exhausting the patience of our readers, by the iteration of arguments and motives which, however eloquently urged, are beginning, we hope and trust, to lose the attraction of *novelty!* We must, therefore, confine our extracts to the concluding portion of this address, which relates more immediately to the views and designs of Bishop Heber, and which teaches us the way in which all who loved and venerated him in his life, may best honour his memory, now that he is taken away. Having adverted to the immense importance of an Archidiaconal Committee of the Society, for the Presidency of Madras, embracing, as it does, the most interesting field of missionary labour, he continues,

It had been at first his (the Bishop's) intention to have formed the Committee immediately on his arrival at the Presidency. But he delayed it for two reasons; first, that in the course of his southern tour he hoped to gain a complete knowledge of the actual state of the native Christians, and the necessities of the several missions, and thus be able to speak to you with greater accuracy from immediate inspection; the other, that he might have longer opportunities of personal intercourse with you, before whom he was to plead their cause, and from the increase of mutual esteem and regard, which would naturally have resulted, he might appeal to your liberality with the more confident hope of full and abundant success. There was, indeed, but little force in this last reason; your love for him would assuredly have been increased by further intercourse, but you did not withhold it from him for a single hour, from the time that he first ministered amongst you at this altar. He could not even then have pleaded with you in vain. The result of his personal observations is a loss never to be repaired, even in that part of his tour which he had already accomplished. You can well imagine how invaluable would have been his mature and deliberate plans for their welfare and revival, when I tell you, that upon those Churches, especially of Tanjore and Trichinopoly, he rested with a complacency and delight which he had felt in no other parts of India, and which (from the unobtrusive character of the missionaries themselves) he had not expected there.

To the means which were in his power for their future good, he directed both the feelings of his heart and the energies of his mind with unremitting concentration. It were worth a thousand arguments to engage your sympathy and co-operation in the same cause, if you could have witnessed the divine benevolence and affection of his manner, when those native converts flocked around him, to receive his blessing, and to partake from his hands the consecrated elements, in those holy mysteries which seemed yet dearer to them, and

more venerable, when administered by him, whom all alike conspired to honour, and in the language of their native land. Had he been permitted to return to this place, to tell you what he had seen and felt, he would have rejoiced to dwell on the numbers, the order, the devotion of their public congregations, and the general superiority of their moral conduct. And, oh! with what touching and resistless eloquence would he then have appealed to you in their behalf, and commended to your powerful kindness these humblest and poorest of his flock! With what earnestness would he have charged you, by the love you bear to the Saviour of your souls, by your gratitude to that blessed Spirit, (through whose sanctifying power alone the sacrifice of your own faith can be accepted) not to cease in your labours of love, till the knowledge of that Saviour is extended to all for whom he died, and the light of that Holy Spirit is diffused, like the light of heaven, over all the kingdoms of the earth. Could he now speak to you from the resting-place of the tomb, or rather from that blessed world whence, enthroned in imperfect and intermediate happiness, he looks down on these holy assemblies of the Churches which he loved,—this would be his earnest and affectionate appeal: “Let not the cause of your Master’s kingdom be the less dear to you because I was not again permitted to challenge for it, in His behalf, your allegiance and support. You repaid my love, while I was among you, with all dutiful and affectionate observance; you cherish my memory, now that I am removed from you for ever. I ask from you this *proof* of your love, that you would impart to others, by means best suited to that end, the blessings you yourselves enjoy—and let your wealth, your influence, and your prayers, be cheerfully directed to this object, *that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified, even as it is with you.*”—P. 29—32.

The mind which is conversant with the views and reflections presented by these two Sermons, *must* become an ardent and zealous friend to this Society, of which it may be said (as it was said of the first Christian labourers and converts), *that it is unknown, and yet well known*; unknown even now to multitudes, whose hearts are warm with Christian zeal and liberality, and yet known and illustrious throughout the world by the good it has effected in every quarter of the globe, with means calamitously disproportioned to its purposes. Hitherto it has advanced its pretensions with a sobriety and reserve, which, perhaps, are not altogether alien from the sacredness and the solemnity of the cause to which it is devoted. But the time is now come, when the wisdom which gave birth to this establishment must be earnestly, and *almost passionately*, justified of her children. They must *cry aloud, and spare not*: without casting an evil eye on the splendid revenues of other institutions, it is yet their duty to protest loudly, incessantly, and vehemently, against the national disgrace of suffering the Society for Propagating the Gospel to languish upon an income of only six thousand pounds a year!

ART. III.—*Friendly Advice on the Management and Education of Children, addressed to Parents of the middle and labouring classes of Society.* Third Edition. London: Hatchard, 1825. pp. 104.

WE are often invited to be present at charity sermons for schools. And as often as the invitation comes, do we bethink ourselves of what

these sermons commonly are, and what, we presume to say it, they ought to be. We dislike the parade and display, *fine* singing, and protracted service. We think the public *effect* of schools is made too much of, and the *domestic* effect of them neglected. We would that the charity sermon should be an occasion for calling the parents of the children together, and addressing them with some homely and useful truths. That this is very possible to be effected without impairing the collection to be made for the charity, the following fact will attest. A clergyman, not long since, on one of these occasions, addressed a few words to the parents of the children; he reminded them, "the sermon is for the benefit of your children,"—he requested them all "to be present;" and, with many other simple words, added the following:

In the next place, it is my duty to tell you, I have long observed, with great sorrow, that the good learnt in these schools is undone by the evil learnt out of them. Schools never can answer their real end, till parents let their children see at home what they read of at school, and lead them, by their own example, to practise what they have been taught. The true use of education is not to make us learned in the eyes of men, but pleasing in the sight of God. It will do little for your children to enable them to do well in this world for a few years, unless they are also made fit to obtain happiness in the next world, which will last for ever. I entreat you, therefore, not to send them to school merely that they may get higher wages by knowing how to read and write; but send them to learn godliness, honesty, and obedience.

The consequence was, that the seats for the poor were crowded to excess,—a general satisfaction was expressed that the poor took so much interest in the schools,—the collection was good,—and some of the poor candidly confessed, that they had not for years before visited the house of God.

We make no apology for thus, apparently, wandering from the path. These remarks are exactly in accordance with the spirit of an interesting little work, which we strongly recommend to public notice. The design of "Friendly Advice" is to carry education further than the school-room, and to make home what home ought to be, be it ever so homely. This little book is calculated to effect all, and more than all which we propose as the desired consequence of a charity sermon for schools. It is the result, we are persuaded, of much observation and thought exercised on the lower ranks of life. Were we desired to describe it, we should say, it was a happy and practical illustration of a reflection made by Bishop Butler. Anal. P. I. ch. v. p. 117. "It is not distinctly attended to by every one, that the occasion which human creatures have for discipline, to improve in them this character of virtue and piety, is to be traced up higher than to excess in the passions, by *indulgence* and habits of vice." This is very ably and skilfully urged on parents. We shall not make extracts with a view to the proof of it, but refer to the work itself; to which, we trust, we shall not do injustice by selecting the following passages.

Every one, who has had much intercourse with the poor, will recognize a homely but faithful picture, and admire the accuracy with which it is drawn. Speaking on the differences which exist between parents on the subject of their children:—

Let them, as they value the interests of their families, conceal the difference from their children and settle it between themselves. If, for example, when a father is correcting his son, the mother will exclaim—"Why can't you let the child alone?—come to mother, Johnny;"—or, when the mother is seriously reproofing him, if the father will interfere—"I wish you'd hold your tongue; you're always at him, poor thing! and he's no worse, that I see, than other people's children;"—if parents will thus bring contempt on each other, how can they expect from their families respect and submission to that authority which they themselves have taught them to despise? Let fathers conscientiously avoid all passionate or extreme severity in the correction of their children, not only because it is sinful in itself, but also on this account—that it almost obliges a mother to take part with her children against their father; and, which is even worse, tempts her to set them the example of deceit and falsehood, in order to screen them from the dreaded storm. On the other hand, the mother is bound to exalt the just authority of her husband, and she must on no account suffer herself, from any false feelings of tenderness, to interfere with that necessary discipline which the father may at times be called upon to exercise.

If parents would gain the respect of their families, they must respect each other, and respect themselves; cautiously avoiding whatever may lessen the weight of their own authority. But we have heard a mother in the presence of her son make use of expressions of this sort, "O Ma'am! that boy'll mind me no more than a post." Now if a mother will speak thus slightlying of herself, the boy will not fail to make good her words; he will soon use saucy language; and remember, saucy language is sure to lead on to unruly conduct.—Pp. 5, 6.

And again :

The more a child is humoured when young, the more trouble will he give as he advances in age; and this will account for those parents that are over-indulgent to their children when little, being often the most severe to them as they grow older: the mother who gives the little one every thing he cries for, will by and by have to strike him to keep his hands from mischief, and to make the house quiet. Therefore, when your infant is passionate and hasty at the sight of a doll or a cake, do not give it him directly—be calm yourself, wait a few moments till his first passion is passed by, endeavour to divert his attention, turn him to the picture on the wall—then, when he is quiet, if it is proper for him, give him the cake or the doll; but if he is old enough, first require him to ask patiently for it. Neither attempt to snatch away the cake or doll from an elder child to give it to the baby, for this is unjust, and will teach your children to be unjust to each other. But some people will say—"Ah, poor things! we must humour them now, for they'll have trouble enough by and by." Little do such persons think that this is the surest way to bring upon themselves and their families the very troubles they fear.—Pp. 7, 8.

But as Christian Remembrancers, we would rather direct the attention of our readers to some of those excellent observations which are more immediately connected with the religious part of education. Sect. viii. On purity and decency.

If the mind is once contaminated, it will then be very difficult to remedy the evil: your chief business, therefore, on this point, is to stand on your defence, to depend more on prevention than cure, to guard against the *first inroads* of corruption. Indecency or unbecoming behaviour in your children must, from

their earliest years, be treated with marks of serious displeasure; never suffer yourselves to be amused by an immodest action; remember what is at stake, and venture not, by a secret smile, to encourage those seeds of evil which, unless destroyed, will speedily bring forth the fruits of vice and misery.—P. 51.

Sect. ix. p. 64, contains a good example of the affectionate and simple style in which the book is written.

And without any share of learning, can you not in the spirit of love bring your little ones around you, and tell them of the great and good God who made them and takes care of them every moment? Can you not tell them of their merciful Saviour Jesus Christ, who loves little children, who came into the world to bless and to save them and all mankind, and of that Holy Spirit which will teach them in the secret of the heart, showing them what is wrong, and leading them to all that is right? As soon as your children understand there is a God, endeavour to impress upon their minds that his eye is ever upon them, that he is pleased when they are good, and offended when they do wrong. Teach them that their merciful God and heavenly Father loves them better than you can do yourselves, that he has commanded all his children to pray to him, and that he who hears the ravens cry, will much more listen to the prayers of the youngest child, for the sake of Jesus Christ, who himself prays for them. At the same time, dwell on the greatness and majesty of God, and enforce the utmost seriousness and reverence in approaching him. It is melancholy to hear some children hurry over the Lord's Prayer and the Belief, as a sort of charm, without understanding either, or distinguishing the one from the other. How can we hope that this lip-service will be acceptable in the sight of Him who searcheth the heart?—Pp. 64, 65.

Sect. x. The observations on Scripture Reading are very judicious and useful, particularly pp. 73, 74, after the striking quotations from the preface to Cranmer's Bible. The Section on Public Worship is equal to the general tone of the book; and the Sabbath, (Sect. xii.) is admirably enforced by quotations and *stories*, which are not *cant*, but simple and authoritative, and followed by some delightful texts.

From Sect. xiii. on Prayer for Children, we will quote nothing; we regard it as the happiest effort of the whole. Rather the happiest strain, for there never was *effort* in writing a passage so simple, so affectionate, so chaste and pious. There is, throughout the little work, a simplicity and tenderness which does honour to the taste and heart which dictated the words. There is great knowledge of human nature, much observation, and much reading and reflection, which are so subdued and tempered, that by many they would not be suspected. As the result, we are amused, instructed, and improved. And to what then shall we object?—to an expression in p. 14? It had better have been altered, at the expense of the anecdote, though we are cautioned that “the language is objectionable.”

We know but one *solemn* objection; and if it be such, it is a grievous thing, for it mars the whole. It is written by a lady. But, be it remembered, it is the misfortune of some arguments to prove too much. We shall not appeal to chairs of professors filled by ladies,—religion adorned,—and unruly spirits won to wisdom,—we are convinced with Burns,

“ How many hints and sage advices
The husband fra’ his wife despises.”

And we despise her not. We commend “ Friendly Advice” to the attention of all persons. We believe it will render not only “ some assistance,” as the authoress modestly writes, (p. ii. preface,) but a very great deal of “ assistance to those . . . who have not better helps, (we have none such to produce,) and whose circumstances must prevent an acquaintance with longer and more finished works of the same nature.”*

ART. IV.—*Adaptations of Scripture to Family Devotion.* London : Joseph Capes, 1827. Pp. 117.

It cannot be denied that the practice of family prayer is attended with some difficulties. The members of a household, called from their several avocations, too often, it is to be feared, approach the throne of grace with minds but ill-prepared to participate in the solemn sacrifice. And never should it be forgotten, that the value of family devotion depends upon the influence it has upon our thoughts and actions ; if we kneel down with distracted minds, if we yield only unto our Maker the service of the lips, we are, and it is a fearful consideration, hardening our hearts, and habituating ourselves to act deceitfully in his presence, who requireth truth in the inward parts. This should lead us not to neglect the observance, but so to regulate our families, that our common devotion may be a source of light, of blessing and of blessedness. Surely there can be but little regularity in that household which cannot be gathered together once a day at least, to offer their common supplications in spirit and in truth. Every one will be able to judge what in his own case will best conduce to attain the desired end ; but there is one particular we are desirous to mention,—that the appointed hour be punctually observed ; for without this we are persuaded all exhortations and all arguments will be in vain. We shall also advance towards our object, the heartfelt worship of God, by a judicious choice of the subject of our devotions ; and this brings us to the little work at the head of our article. The author observes in his preface :

The idea which led to the composition of this work, was, that a sensible improvement in family devotion would be effected, if the passages read from Scripture, as an introduction to the prayers which are to follow, were more intimately connected with those prayers, and had a tendency not merely to prepare the hearers generally for *any* devotional exercise, which is all that is usually

* We cannot omit this opportunity of cautioning our readers against several editions of this work which have been published by different societies, with alterations, of which we highly disapprove. The genuine edition which we have here noticed, and which is the only one which we can recommend, is published by Hatchard.

attempted, but to prepare them for the particular petitions, thanksgivings, and intercessions, meant to be introduced.

The adoption of this plan has many contingent advantages. One consequence is, *greater variety*. The prevailing custom of repeating the same topics every day, in all forms of morning and evening prayer, with no material change in any thing but the language, deprives each form of all specific character, and thus communicates a sameness to the whole, by no means favourable to devotion.

The adaptation of prayers to particular portions of Scripture, has also this recommendation, that it causes a greater *connexion* between the several parts of the composition than otherwise can be easily attained. So long as one uninterrupted chain of ideas is pursued in any prayer, the attention of the hearers may, without much difficulty, be sustained; and such a chain will naturally be pursued, when either one subject only is attended to, or when at least the links by which the ideas are connected in Scripture, are made use of in the prayer. In many works of this kind, though in other respects of considerable merit, in consequence of the transitions of subject being frequent and abrupt, the assembled family, however piously inclined, must find some difficulty in following the reader: their minds are not properly engaged in one topic before they are hurried to another, with which the preceding one had no manner of connexion, and which would not naturally have followed in the ordinary association of ideas.—P. iii—v.

This is very sensible and very true: we will now produce an example.

NO. X.—GOD'S MERCIES A MOTIVE TO SANCTIFICATION.

Read the xii. chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

Let us pray.

O God, our heavenly Father, from whom proceedeth every good and every perfect gift, we thine unworthy servants, devoutly grateful for thine unnumbered mercies, desire to render thee our humble offering of thanks, and to ask the help of thy grace, that we may show forth our thankfulness, not only with our lips, but by the sanctification of our lives.

We bless thee for our creation and preservation; for our health, food, and raiment; for protection against dangers, comfort in afflictions, and all thine other mercies in this mortal life; but above all, for the hope of life eternal, through thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ.

In gratitude for these unspeakable benefits, which deserve in return far warmer thanks, and far more devoted services, than it is in our power to render; dispose us, we pray thee, to present our souls and bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to thee, which is our reasonable service. Grant that, instead of being conformed to this world, we may be transformed by the renewing of our minds, so as to do thy perfect will.

Incline us to regard each other with undissembled affection; vying with one another in love; preferring one another in honour.

Preserve us from idleness, both in temporal and spiritual things, that we may not be slothful in business, but fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.

Make us joyful in hope of eternal life; patient in affliction, and, though we do not at once obtain our desires, persevering in prayer.

Dispose us to contribute to the necessities of saints, to show kindness to unbelievers, and to sympathize with all; rejoicing with them that rejoice, and weeping with them that weep.

Suffer not our spiritual gifts to make us think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think; but teach us to think soberly; knowing that, as members of thy church, we are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.

Dispose us all to the performance of our duty in that state of life to which we have been respectively called; he that teacheth being diligent in teaching; he

that serveth in serving; he that giveth, giving with simplicity; and he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

Finally, enable us to bless from the heart them that curse us, and to do good to them that hate us, not taking vengeance into our own hands, but leaving retribution to thee. If our enemy hunger, dispose us to feed him; if he thirst, to give him drink; that, by heaping mercies on his head, we may melt his temper into kindness, and, instead of being overcome of evil, overcome evil with good.

This we beg for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Advocate and Mediator. Amen.—P. 86—91.

The plan proposed by our author is excellent, and we would strongly recommend its adoption; of the execution, the specimen we have given will enable our readers to judge, and for ourselves we can say of this manual, that it well deserves our praise.

ART. V.—*Sermons preached at Christ Church, Bath, before the National Schools. By the Rev. F. KILVERT, M.A. London: Duncan, 1827.*

HERE is a little volume which well deserves a notice in our pages. It seems to furnish a happy specimen of what may be done in an attempt to address the lower orders, and particularly the children of the lower orders, in a manner level to their comprehension. He who writes for children must, indeed, forego almost all the ornaments of style; but, in general, it will be found that the flow of the language, as well as of the thoughts, is natural and easy. And if the vehicle is commodious, the wares it contains are also good. There is in this book a simple and sincere exposition of Christian faith and Christian practice, in which the leading doctrines are fairly stated, yet so as to appear in an intelligible form even to very confined capacities. From a work in which there is but little that is striking, it could hardly be expected that selections should be given. It may be sufficient to mention the two Sermons on Confirmation, that on Gratitude, and that on Filial Obedience, as fair specimens. In fine, we may safely recommend these Sermons to the attention of those who may be looking out for any additional means of spreading the knowledge of the truth among illiterate people, particularly the young.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE CHARACTER AND DUTIES OF A CLERGYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—In a former number, you noticed, with deserved commendation, a Charge lately delivered by Archdeacon Bayley. In perusing this admirable Charge itself, I met with a passage, not quoted by you, which contains so eloquent and affecting a picture of the character and duties of a Clergyman, that I will not hesitate to offer it for insertion in your pages.

“ The last point to which I shall advert at present is that which regards the more personal and ordinary offices of the Clergy. From the low, and almost irreverent, meaning too frequently applied to the term ‘ serving a Church,’ it might be supposed that our business begins and ends with the Sabbath, and that the pulpit is the only place for teaching Christianity. Such was not the opinion, nor such the practice, of St. Paul : ‘ *Preach the Word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.*’ Sacerdotal functions, indeed, may seem to belong almost exclusively to the Lord’s day and the Lord’s house; but pastoral ministrations are applicable to every hour and every cottage. And, therefore, the ordination vow obliges us to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within our cures, as need shall require and occasion be given. Now, in the whole compass of duty, there is none of such decided use, or rather, of such imperious necessity; none that requires so much delicacy, so much discretion. It requires, too, something of that spirit which made the Son of Man a friend of Publicans and sinners; which caused the Lord of all to minister to the poor, and wash his disciples’ feet. To go about doing good, to visit from house to house, not officiously, but kindly, conversing, in the meekness of wisdom, cheerfully and seriously, maintaining and setting forward quietness, peace and love; to be ‘ still at hand without request,’* in the hour of misfortune and at the couch of sickness, strengthening the diseased, binding up the broken-hearted, pouring oil and wine into the wounds of affliction; awakening contrition, and teaching the lesson of penitence, faith and hope; sometimes speaking peace to the waves of a troubled conscience, and sometimes smoothing the pillow of the dying saint. This it is to imitate and obey the great Shepherd of the flock; this it is to feed his lambs, to know our own, and to be known of them; to make our voice heard by the sheep, and to call them all by their names; to preserve them from the scattering of the wolf, to seek those that are lost, and bring again that which was driven away; to lead them into the pastures of Christ, and make them lie down by the still streams of living waters.”

Omitting, for I fear to trespass too much upon your pages, some eloquent passages in which the Archdeacon sets forth the encouragements of the pious minister, I will pass on to where he speaks of what are commonly called the occasional duties of the Clergy.

“ In fact (he observes), the duties, which are styled occasional, are constant and universal; they constitute the regular engagement of the hand and heart and time of the Clergyman. They call upon him to rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with them that weep: in short, they extend to every circumstance of life, and every variety of being; they commence with the cradle, and terminate only with the grave. It is in scenes like these, and by a proper improvement of them, that the Pastor must seek, and can seldom fail to gain, influence; ‘ for where there is due watchfulness and working on one side, there will very rarely be wanting a due love and esteem on the other.’† By thus condescending to be the servant to the least of his

* Dryden’s Good Parson.

† Bishop Gibson’s Charge.

brethren, he will make them feel and understand that he becomes so for the sake and in the name of their common Master. Convinced that their temporal, their daily and hourly good is an object of his affectionate care, they will give a more ready attention and credit to his zeal for their eternal welfare."

These passages naturally suggest many reflections; and there is one, which, though obvious, is so seasonable and just, that I cannot refrain from making it. To do this with better effect, I will use the words* of an old writer, with which, I believe, few of your readers will find themselves acquainted, substituting only "charge" for "book."

"The effect of publishing this *charge* will be in no mediocrity. It will do either exceeding great good to the Clergy, or exceeding much prejudice; much good, if it work so upon the Clergy, as effectually to persuade them to conform to that holy character delineated in this *charge*. Otherwise it will produce much prejudice, by framing so perfect an idea of a curate of souls in the minds of the laity; and by erecting such a great expectation and desire, that he who takes care of *theirs*, be exactly such an one as this *charge* has described: Wherein if they be frustrated, *all* will be sorry, *some* will murmur and rage, *others* will perhaps forsake their *Parish Church*, if not the *English: Deus avertat.*

"The portraiture of virtue in general displayed by eloquence is very amiable. But perfections proper to any of the three grand vocations (especially that of the Clergy, daily attendant on the Holy One), the more accurately their character be imprinted in the minds of others, the more despicable do they render the professors that want them. And the ordinary sort of people, which are the most, will wrest the defects of the man upon the profession, and, at the next remove, upon the best accomplished professors.

"This consideration gives me the cue, to insert here a most passionate request, which I tender to the younger Clergy, by the mercies of God, by the meekness and gentleness of Christ (of whose eternal priesthood they have a share), and by the preciousness of their own and others' souls, committed to their charge, that they will seriously consider whether my last conjecture be no more probable: if they think it so, there will be less need to intreat them to forecast, or bethink themselves *what a stock of learning and prudence, the occasions of THESE times* (conference with sectaries and disputation with Papists) will require, what an habit of gravity in attire, and of retiredness in conversation, is necessary to make a Clergyman exemplary to the loose and vain conversation of these days; what an actual degree of virtue and godliness it must be that must withstand the incursion of profaneness in this age. And there will be not so much need to beseech them to buy fathers, councils, and other good classic books; to mortify the flesh with study, fasting, and prayer; and to do every thing becoming a curate of souls: using this *charge* as a looking-glass, to inform them what is decent."

C. R.

* See the Address to the Second Edition of George Herbert's *Priest to the Temple*, published in 1671, by Barnabas Oley.

ORIGIN OF PARISHES.

PARISHES, derived from the word *Preostscyre*, which signifies the precinct of which the priest had the care, or the *priestshire*, differ in size according to the difference in extent of the several circuits, demesnes, or territories, possessed by the founders of the parish church. Originally, the *parochia* was the diocese or episcopal district in which the Bishop and his Clergy lived; and the tithes and oblations of religious persons being esteemed holy, and pertaining only to God and the church, were brought to the Cathedral, the place of residence of the Bishop and his Clergy. But when Lords of Manors, and other laymen having large possessions, began to erect churches on their estates, the patronage of such churches was vested in the respective founders, and, by degrees, the tithes arising from their estates were considered as due only to the incumbents of their churches. Thus the right of an incumbent to tithes extended only to the possessions of his patron, of which he had the spiritual superintendence, *i. e.* his parish. *See Mirehouse on Tithes.*

ON THE MIRACLES OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

THE question, respecting the duration of Miracles in the primitive Church, though not immediately affecting the evidences of our faith, is one of sufficient interest at all times to engage the attention of the pious believer; and it has derived additional interest from the clear and lucid manner in which the subject has been treated, and the new light which has been thrown upon it, by the Bishop of Lincoln, in his work on "the Ecclesiastical History of the Second and Third Centuries, illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian." After producing the important testimony of Tertullian to the wider diffusion of the Christian faith in his times, he observes that

The writings of Tertullian furnish little reason for supposing that the preachers of the gospel in his day were indebted for their success to the display of those supernatural powers, by which the Apostles and first preachers of the gospel were enabled to prove their divine commission.—P. 95.

And he mentions, as the conclusion, to which he was led by a comparison of the statements in the Acts of the Apostles with the Fathers of the second century, that

The power of working miracles was not extended beyond the disciples, upon whom the Apostles laid their hands. As the number of those disciples gradually diminished, the instances of the exercise of these miraculous powers became continually less frequent, and ceased entirely at the death of the last individual upon whom the hands of the Apostles had been laid. That event would, in the natural course of things, take place before the middle of the second century; at a time when, Christianity having obtained a footing in all the provinces of the Roman empire, the miraculous gifts conferred upon its first teachers had performed their appropriate office—that of proving to the world that a new revelation had been given from heaven. What then would be the effect produced upon the minds of the great body of Christians by their gradual cessation? Many would not observe, none would be willing to observe it; for all must naturally feel reluctant to believe that powers, which had contributed so essentially to the rapid growth of Christianity, had been withdrawn.

They who remarked the cessation of miracles would probably persuade themselves that it was only temporary, and designed by an all-wise Providence to be the prelude to a more abundant effusion of supernatural gifts upon the Church: or, if doubts and misgivings crossed their minds, they would still be unwilling openly to state a fact, which might shake the steadfastness of their friends, and would certainly be urged by the enemies of the gospel as an argument against its divine origin. They would pursue the plan which has been pursued by Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Irenæus, &c.; they would have recourse to general assertions of the existence of supernatural powers, without attempting to produce a specific instance of their exercise.*

The Bishop remarks, in the following paragraph,

I collect from passages already cited from the Acts of the Apostles, that the power of working miracles was conferred by the hands of the Apostles only, and consequently ceased with the last disciples on whom their hands were laid. I perceive in the language of the Fathers, who lived in the middle and end of the second century, when speaking on this subject, something which betrays, if not a conviction, at least a suspicion, that the power of working miracles was withdrawn, combined with a desire to keep up a belief of its continuance in the Church. They affirm in general terms, that miracles were performed, but rarely venture to produce an instance of a particular miracle, &c. &c.

In confirmation of these remarks, the Bishop produces some passages from Tertullian (see pp. 102, 103, and note, p. 103), relating to the exorcism of daemons, which are the only specific instances which he mentions of the exercise of miraculous powers. But with regard to these instances, he justly remarks,

Surely if miraculous powers existed in the Church, the writings of Tertullian would have supplied some less equivocal instances of their exercise.

And with regard to his general assertion, of the existence of miraculous powers in the church, he remarks, in another place, that

He casts a doubt upon the accuracy of his own statement, by ascribing to Christians in general those extraordinary gifts, which even in the days of the Apostles, appear to have been confined to them, and to the disciples upon whom they laid their hands.†—Acts vi. 6. (compared with vi. 8. and viii. 6.) viii. 17. xix. 6.

But perhaps the most conclusive arguments against the existence of miraculous powers in the church, in the age of Tertullian, are contained in a learned note of his Lordship, in p. 100.

In the *Tract de Pudicitia*, he (Tertullian) is contending that the Church possesses not the power of pardoning certain offences; but foreseeing that the example of the Apostles, who had pardoned these offences, might be objected to him, he thus anticipates the objection:—“*Itaque si et ipsos beatos Apostolos, tale aliquid indulsisse constaret, cuius venia a Deo, non ab homine, competet, non ex disciplina, sed ex potestate fecisse.*” The meaning is, that the Apostles pardoned those offences, not in the ordinary course of Church discipline, but by a peculiar power vested in themselves. “*Nam et mortuos suscitaverunt quod Deus solus: et debiles redintegraverunt quod nemo nisi Christus: &c.*” After a few remarks, he then proceeds,—“*Exhibe igitur et nunc mihi apostolice, prophetica (f. legendum apostolica et prophetica) exempla et (f. ut) agnoscam divinitatem, et vindica tibi delictorum ejusmodi remittendorum potestatem. Quod si disciplina solius officia sortitus es, nec imperio praesidere sed ministerio, quis aut quantus es indulgere? qui neque Prophetam nec Apostolum exhibens, cares ea virtute cuius est indulgere.*” It is evident that the whole passage proceeds on the

* Pp. 97, 98.

† Pp. 95, 96.

supposition, that the miraculous powers which had been exerted by the Prophets and Apostles no longer subsisted, since if they did subsist, the individual possessing them might exercise the apostolic or prophetic privilege of pardoning the offences in question. Again, with reference to the miracle of our Lord related in Matthew ix. he remarks,—“Si Dominus tantum de potestatis sue probatione curavit, ut traduceret cogitatus et ita imperaret sanitatem, ne non crederetur posse delicta dimittere; non licet mihi eandem potestatem in aliquo sine iisdem probationibus credere.” In the Tract de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, where Tertullian calls upon the Heretics to declare what miracles had been wrought by the founders of their several sects, it is worthy of remark, that he does not appeal to any instance of the exercise of miraculous powers in his own day, c. 30. See also c. 44. Now the Tract de Pudicitia was certainly written after Tertullian had embraced the opinions of Montanus.*

With regard to the Tract de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, Allix supposes it to have been written *after* he became a Montanist; the Bishop of Lincoln concludes, from internal evidence, that it was written *before* that period.† If the *latter* supposition be the true one, we have the evidence of Tertullian both *before* and after his embracing the opinions of Montanus. If we admit the *former*, his testimony is probably more independent, and furnishes an illustration of the Bishop of Lincoln's remark in another place, on the value of the writings of Tertullian, that

The value of Tertullian's writings to the theological student arises in a great measure from his errors. When he became a Montanist, he set himself to expose what he deemed faulty in the practice and discipline of the Church; thus we are told indirectly what that practice and that discipline were, and we obtain information, which but for his secession from the Church, his works would scarcely have supplied.‡

These passages will probably be thought conclusive, as far as Tertullian is concerned; but an examination of some of the passages, which are usually alleged to prove the existence of miraculous powers in the church, in the second and third centuries, will tend to confirm the truth of the Bishop of Lincoln's observation with regard to the Fathers of this period, that they assert generally the existence of supernatural powers, without attempting to produce a specific instance of their exercise.

I shall content myself with referring to some of the passages, which are referred to by Dr. Dodwell, in his second Dissertation on Irenæus.

Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, asserts the prevalence of the *charismata*, or *miraculous gifts*, which then rested upon the church, and upon the church only. “Παρὰ γάρ, ἡμῖν καὶ μέχρι τύν προφητικὰ χαρίσματά ἔστιν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ αὐτοὶ συνίεναι ὀφείλετε, ὅτι τὰ πάλαι ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν ὄντα εἰς ἡμᾶς μετειόην.”§ He says, in a subsequent passage, “that no more prophets will arise in their nation, as was the case of old, which, indeed, you may yourselves see to be the case; for, after Him (*i.e.* Christ), no other prophet has arisen among you.” And he afterwards asserts the existence of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit: “Καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν καὶ θηλεῖας καὶ ἄρσενας,

* P. 56.

† P. 38.

VOL. IX. NO. VII.

‡ P. 50.

§ Justin Op. p. 308. Edit. Paris.

3 K

χαρίσματα δπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔχοντας." We may remark that the language of Justin is here very indefinite. He does not say whether it was the power of working miracles which was permitted to the Christians of his day, or some extraordinary communication of the Holy Spirit. If we understand it of the *former*, it affords a striking proof of the truth of what the Bishop says with regard to the Fathers "asserting generally the existence of miraculous powers, without attempting to produce a specific instance of their exercise." And what his Lordship remarks with regard to Tertullian, is true of Justin Martyr, that he casts a doubt on the accuracy of his own statement, by ascribing to Christians in general those extraordinary gifts which, even in the days of the Apostles, appear to have been confined to them, and to the disciples upon whom they laid their hands. If Dr. Dodwell could have found any other passages in Justin which were more to his purpose than these, it seems probable that he would have referred to them; and if Justin had been able to produce any distinct evidence of the exercise of miraculous powers in the church, it seems natural that either in his *Apologies*, or in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*, he would not have neglected to bring forward a testimony so convincing to the enemies of the faith.

Dr. Dodwell quotes the testimony of Irenæus to the existence of miracles in his day.* Speaking of the pretended miracles of the Carpocratians, Valentinians, &c., he says, "they cannot give sight to the blind, or hearing to the deaf; they cannot expel dæmons, or cure the infirm, lame, and paralytic;" and then he proceeds, "Tantum autem absunt ab eo ut mortuum excitent, quemadmodum Dominus excitavit, et Apostoli per orationem, et in fraternitate sæpissime propter aliquid necessarium *cā quæ est in quoquo loco Ecclesia universa Ecclesia postulante per jejunium et supplicationem multam reversus est spiritus mortui, et donatus est homo orationibus sanctorum, ut ne quidem credant hoc in totum posse fieri.*" A learned writer, in a contemporary journal (the *Christian Observer*, Vol. XXVI. p. 396), throws a just suspicion on the genuineness of the passage marked in italics, which bears every internal evidence of being the interpolation of a later period; for in addition to the improbability of his assertion, that the restoration of the dead to life was *very frequently* granted to the prayers of the church, only three instances of raising the dead are recorded even of our Lord himself, only one of St. Peter, and one of St. Paul.† If this passage is not genuine, the quotation proves nothing at all with regard to the testimony of Irenæus; and with respect to another passage (Irenæus, Lib. II. 57. p. 188), Irenæus makes the same vague and indefinite assertion as to the existence of miraculous powers in the church. With regard to the sentence in it, in which he has been supposed to bear testimony to the fact of the restoration of the dead to life—*ηδη ἐτελείσθησαν, καὶ παρέμειναν σὺν ἡμῖν ικανοῖς ἔτεσι*,—the writer, to

* Irenæus, Ed. Grabe. p. 186.

† The sense is more complete without it: "Tantum autem absunt ab eo ut mortuum excitent, quemadmodum Christus excitavit et Apostoli per orationem, ut ne quidem credant hoc in totum posse fieri."

whom we have before referred, makes the following just and pertinent remarks:—

That the resurrections from the dead were miracles of a *past* age, and were at that time extinct, appears to be evident from these words. Why did he not say they are with us *now*? He cannot be suspected of understating an argument in his favour. Why did he not challenge them to inquire, and name persons and places? The reason is plain: they were dead long ago; he is appealing to past resurrections, and thereby tacitly acknowledges that there were no longer any such things.*—(*To be continued.*)

No. 5.—**STRICTURES ON BELSHAM'S TRANSLATION OF ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.**

WE must now consider Mr. Belsham as an annotator; for he has accompanied his version with a considerable body of "Notes." In the execution of this part of our task, we feel ourselves perplexed and overwhelmed by the multitude of materials; we must content ourselves with submitting some general observations.

It cannot fail to strike every reader, who is conversant with the writings of theologians, that the prevailing character of the annotations is **SUPERFICIALITY**. Here are no proofs of extensive reading, no examples of felicitous conjecture, no results of deep research, no specimens of philological acuteness, no instances of keen and close reasoning. The mode of argument, though positive and dogmatical, is not convincing; and the very paradoxes, which are thickly spread therein, are destitute of ingenuity, and, for the most part, of novelty. The whole constitutes a dull accumulation of common-place remark, sophistical exposition, presumptuous assertion, and school-boy criticism. It is a stream, shallow, though confined within narrow banks, and, though perpetually flowing, perpetually turbid. Page succeeds page in the perusal, without meeting with any thing to please the imagination, any thing to enlighten the understanding, any thing to warm the heart. The task of perusal is like the toil of the wanderer in those sultry and barren wastes, where nought of vegetation exists to refresh the weary sight. Notwithstanding the pomp and parade of the "long personal detail" with which the volumes are ushered into the world, and the revision, correction, and improvement, which, we are told in the prefixed "Advertisement," they have received from the author's maturer reflection, they are a work of much promise, but, in the execution, a feeble attempt to buttress the shattered temple of Socinianism. Accustomed to the short and volatile effusions of the Unitarian advocates, the reader may be surprised at the number and size of these volumes; but a closer acquaintance will convince him that, in the present case, an extension of bulk is but an extension of imbecility.

Those who aspire to enlighten the religious part of the community, are in duty bound to obtain a knowledge of what has been done by their predecessors in the same department, that they may avail themselves of every help to the attainment of their object. But Mr. Belsham

has contented himself with a very limited acquaintance with those who have preceded him in the exposition of the Bible. He never appeals to any, except the most common, and usually not to the most valuable writers, and appears to be either totally ignorant of the best Biblical critics and commentators, or, what amounts to much the same thing, to have neglected them. Next to Unitarian authors, whom, of course, he regards with the deference due to masters and guides, he is most partial to Locke, Taylor, Peirce, Chandler, and Rosenmüller. Of John Locke it is impossible for a British scholar to speak, except in terms of high admiration; but while we yield to none in respect for him as a philosopher, we contemplate him, we must confess, in a less favourable light as a divine. He had neither the learning nor the knowledge of the ancient languages, necessary to sound scriptural interpretation; and, in the present state of exegetic theology, his "Paraphrase and Notes" are not of any great importance. With much higher erudition, though with vastly inferior native talent, Dr. John Taylor gave to the world a "Paraphrase on the Epistle to the Romans," to which he prefixed a "Key to the Apostolical Writings," which, if it have been too much depreciated on the one hand, has certainly been too much praised on the other. His Hebrew Concordance is invaluable, but he was not equally successful as a commentator; and though his attainments were respectable, and his industry unwearyed, we cannot allow him even the second rank among scriptural expositors. To Peirce and Chandler must be assigned a place somewhat lower than to Dr. Taylor. The "Scholia" of the elder Rosenmüller, useful as they are, particularly to young students, are, for the most part, a mere compilation, generally well executed indeed, but requiring neither extraordinary judgment nor research. To these may be added Schleusner's Lexicon, which is often referred to; but notwithstanding the sprinkling of *rationalism* in this otherwise excellent work, and the disingenuous mode in which it is cited by Socinians,* it is not sufficiently *liberal* for their purpose. Why these authors are the objects of Mr. Belsham's partiality, it is not difficult to assign the reason; they are not destitute of merit, and, though they cannot be deemed downright Socinians, they have a leaning towards that cheerless system.

Not only are the volumes under consideration extremely superficial, but they abound with mistakes of such a nature as, every favourable allowance being made, can only be attributed to ignorance. This, like every other grave and serious charge, ought not to be made without substantiating it by unambiguous proofs. It is easy to accuse a writer of ignorance, a practice too common among polemics; but it is right to withhold our assent until ample confirmation is produced, and we have no wish that our readers should believe such a charge on our bare word. With this impression upon our minds, we nevertheless declare our undisguised belief, that the work in question contains numerous errors which cannot be deemed oversights, errors so palpable as ought to excite a blush upon the cheek of him who dares, in this

* The Bishop of Salisbury has given some examples in his "Tracts on the Divinity of Christ."

plenitude of folly, to expound the Oracles of God. Though we speak of confirmation, is any further confirmation absolutely requisite than what has already been produced? Have we not given many undoubted proofs of ignorance, as well as rashness, in the proposed alterations of the sacred text? Have we not adduced instances of mistakes in translating which can scarcely proceed from any other cause than the want of learning? The charge of ignorance, then, naturally results from the preceding remarks, and upon these grounds we should be justified in making it; but we pledge ourselves to bring forward additional proof.

We shall not stop to prove that a certain measure of oriental literature is not only a useful, but a necessary qualification to the theologian. This is universally granted by those who are competent to give an opinion; and it is evident to common sense that it is impossible to explain the Old Testament, without being familiar with Hebrew and Chaldee, in which languages it was composed. It is equally absurd to suppose that the evangelical and apostolical writings, which abound with Hebraic phraseology, can be rightly interpreted without some tincture of oriental learning. This more particularly applies to the Epistles of St. Paul, who was a Pharisee, conversant with the learning of his sect, and intimately acquainted with their opinions; and, consequently, without a certain degree of Rabbinical knowledge, it is impossible fully to comprehend many of his reasonings, idioms, and allusions. The utility of Hebrew to the interpreter of the New Testament is undeniable, not only in expounding the quotations from the Old Testament, but also in explaining the allusions to Jewish modes of thinking, and the numerous phrases where, though the words are Greek, the idiom is eastern. As to the quotations from the Old Testament, it is necessary to have recourse to the original, in order to examine whether the Received Version be correct, whether it accords with the citation of the Apostle, and whether, should there be, as there sometimes is, an apparent discrepancy, they may not be reconciled by the exercise of judicious criticism. Such is the proceeding of the well-qualified commentator on the Christian Scriptures, but it may, with equal confidence, be asserted, that such is not the proceeding of Mr. Belsham. Nowhere does he appeal to the Hebrew verity; nowhere does he ascertain the sense of the Jewish Scriptures quoted in the Apostles' writings, by a critical investigation of their meaning; nowhere does he attempt to reconcile discordant passages by the application of oriental literature. All his remarks on the original Hebrew are taken at second hand; always referring to the opinions and authority of others, never speaking from his own knowledge. We use language thus unrestricted, because, after a careful examination of his volumes with a view to this point, we have not noticed a single exception to the universality of this statement. In treating of those quotations from the Old Testament, where we might reasonably expect some display of Hebrew learning, he entirely fails us, having contributed no new light, nor even a single remark which can be supposed to be drawn from an attentive study of the Jewish original.

The peculiar phrases and idioms commonly called Hebraisms, which are numerous in the apostolical writings, and to the exposition of which

oriental literature is requisite, he either passes over without notice, or, if he does notice them, it is only in a short observation borrowed from some preceding commentator. It would be a waste of time to confirm this by examples; it will be quite enough to refer to the author's "Exposition and Notes" on Rom. i. 24. xi. 8. 1 Cor. i. 10. ii. 2. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Col. iii. 2. Heb. v. 7; in which texts, and in multitudes of the like kind, the Hebraisms are left unexplained, while in very many others, in the interpretation of which he happens to be right, by following the commentators, he takes no notice of the Hebraism, and, as should seem, is right only by chance. But examples are not wanting wherein he has been led into error, apparently through ignorance of the Hebraistical turn of the expression. Thus Rom. vii. 24. Mr. B. renders, "Who shall deliver me from this dead body?" but the original is literally, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" where the word "body" is used like נֶרֶת for the substance and reality of any thing; and the meaning is, Who shall deliver me from this state which is really death, inasmuch as it must end in death? Compare chap. vi. 6. Col. iii. 5; and see Schoettgen's *Horæ Heb.* in loc. and Nov. Test. edit. Koppiana in loc. Mr. B. renders 1 Cor. viii. 3. "But if any man love God, by him God is known;" a truism indeed, but of trifling signification. Now the New Testament writers occasionally use verbs in a transitive sense, after the manner of Hebrew verbs in Hiphil, which is the case in the text before us, where ἵγνωσται means is made to know, i. e. is taught, as Gal. iv. 9. This yields an excellent sense; "He who loves God is taught by him," is instructed in the Christian religion, having the eyes of his understanding enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Mr. B. mentions, that Locke gives the verb an Hiphil sense, and that he did not adopt it can only be accounted for by his not feeling the force of the Hebraic idiom. Ephes. iii. 21. is rendered by Mr. B. "throughout all the generations of this most excellent dispensation;" but no Hebraic scholar, who recollects such phrases as לְעוֹלָם עַלְקִים and לְדוֹר דּוֹרִים, could so translate the Apostle's words. The meaning is, as E. T. "throughout all ages, world without end." If the reader will compare the "Eclectic Version" of Gal. iii. 2. and Heb. xi. 32. with Vorstius, *De Hebraismis*, cap. 3, and 12. de Fischer, he will find other examples of Mr. Belsham's Hebraic attainments.

Whether a deficiency in Hebrew learning amounts to an entire disqualification for interpreting the Sacred Writings, we shall not determine; but it is unquestionably a great and lamentable defect. An oriental cast and colouring pervades the New Testament, which can neither be clearly perceived, nor well understood, without the aid of the literature of the East. Under this designation we include Rabbinical learning, as well as a knowledge of the Eastern dialects; and from these sources a strong and steady light has been diffused over the apostolical writings. Without some acquaintance with the oriental tongues, it is scarcely possible to profit even by the researches of those who have been distinguished for this kind of erudition; as Oleareus, Lightfoot, Viser, Glassius, Leusden, Vorstius, Schoettgen, Meuschen. But to this learned and eminent society Mr. Belsham has never been introduced; or, if he have perchance passed through the ceremony of

a formal introduction, he has made his bow and retired, without venturing to cultivate an intimacy with characters of so high a rank. Those who are not admitted into friendship with the great and the noble, must be content to associate with a less elevated class; and Mr. Belsham, discarding, and discarded by, the distinguished society just named, has formed a friendly union with Wakefield, Lindsey, Tyrwhitt, Priestley, the *Fratres Polonorum*, *et hoc genus omne*, whom he regards as the lights of the world, and the champions of true religion, because they are champions of Unitarianism!

“ I AM THE WAY, AND THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE.”

Thou art the Way—to Thee alone
From sin and death we flee;
And he who would the Father seek,
Must seek him, Lord, by thee.

Thou art the Truth—thy Word alone
True wisdom can impart;
Thou only canst inform the mind,
And purify the heart.

Thou art the Life—the rending tomb
Proclaims thy conq’ring arm,
And them who put their trust in thee,
Nor death nor hell shall harm.

Thou art the Way, the Truth, the Life;
Grant us that Way to know,
That Truth to keep, that Life to win,
Whose joys eternal flow.

GEORGE W. DOANE, A.M. New York.

CIRCUMCISION.

MR. EDITOR.—Your correspondent *Lleuvellyn* observes on this subject :

During the period that the Israelites endured bondage in Egypt, they carefully observed the rite of circumcision divinely imposed upon them; whilst passing through the wilderness they entirely neglected it, until after they had passed over Jordan, when this seal of the ceremonial law was re-established by Joshua.

He then makes the following queries :

How does it consist with the legal and typical character of Moses, especially after the awful warning he had received, for omitting to circumcise his own son, to have suffered this neglect? And how does it consist with that of Joshua, the type of the Saviour, by whom that covenant was fulfilled and abrogated, to have been the minister to revive it?

I have not met with any explanation of the omission which appears to me satisfactory; yet, I think, there is some ground for believing that there was good reason for the omission.

The only attempts to account for it, which I have met with, are, a note from Bishop Patrick, in D’Oyly and Mant’s Bible, a passage in Lamy’s Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures, one in Buxtorf’s *Synagoga Judaica*, and another in Shuckford’s Connection, book 12. The note from Bishop Patrick is as follows :

As they were then in a wandering condition, and wholly uncertain at what time the removal of the cloud would summon them to proceed on their journey, they would have endangered their lives by submitting to an operation which rendered them incapable of moving immediately with safety.

This reason appears to me to apply only to adults; infants of eight days old must, at all events, be carried; and, therefore, the circumstance of the Israelites moving immediately after any operation, would not, as it appears to me, affect those who were the subjects of the operation.

The passage in Lamy is as follows:

La circoncision ne fut point pratiquée, tout le tems que les Hébreux errerent dans les Deserts de l'Arabie. Cuneé en rapporte deux raisons. L'une qu' étant obligé à décamper souvent, la foibleesse des nouveaux circoncis, les auroit extrêmement embarrassé. L'autre, que comme dans cette solitude, il n'y avoit pas d'autre nation avec qui le peuple de Dieu pût se mêler, cette marque de distinction n'étoit pas nécessaire.

The first of these reasons is the same as that stated by Bishop Patrick, and liable to the same objection.* The second of these reasons is sufficiently answered, I think, by Lamy himself. He says—

On peut objecter à cela, que la circoncision n'étoit pas simplement un caractère extérieur, qui distinguoit les Juifs; mais qu'elle étoit encore une cérémonie sacrée, qui attiroit beaucoup de grâces sur ceux qui la recevoient.—Page 4.

The passage from Buxtorf, pp. 103-4, is as follows:—

“Hic etiam fusè disputant (i.e. the Cabalists) Cur ii, qui in deserto nati sunt, per quadraginta annos circumcisi non fuerint? Utique id non est factum propter nequitiam, et obstinatam illorum malitiam. Absit. Sed quia per quadraginta annos Boreas non spiravit in deserto. Hoc enim spirante salubris valde est omnis sanguinis missio: eo verò non spirante, vulnera omnia admodum sunt periculosa. Hinc medicum illud axioma ipsum, sed sermone Chaldaico: ‘Diebus nubilosis, et qui Euro perlantur, neque circumcidimus, neque venam secamus.’ Verum objiciat aliquis; Quum quotidie ad circumcidendum necessitate adigamur, qui Aquilonem observare et exspectare possumus, qui non quotidie spirat? Scrupulum hunc solvunt sapientes in Talmud: Dicunt enim, quatuor ventos si gulsi diebus flare; singulisque immixtum esse Aquilonem, aliquando etiam reliquos omnes superare; ac proinde singulis diebus sine discriminè circumcisionem celebrari posse. Ventum autem Septentriionalem tum temporis non spirasse, hinc conjicere est; quid natura sua nubes discutiat, et serenitatem inducat, ut apud Jobum habetur (xxxvii. 21.) ‘Ventus transiens fugat nubes, ab Aquilone venit aurum,’ i. e. suda et serena tempestas, instar auri radians et refulgens. Itaque si tum ventus iste increbuisse, nubem gloriæ, quæ populum Israeliticum comitabatur, submovisset et dissipasset, unde multa et magna populus accepisset incommoda, &c. Sed mysteria omnia non sunt revelanda. Qui potest, iisque delectat, legat Kimchiūm in locum illum quem paulò supra ex Josua citavimus, et Talmudem in Tractatu Jebhammos, i. e. De fratribus, seu fratribus absque liberis defuncti uxore ducendā, cap. 8. cuius initium est Hearel, ubi multa alia eximia abstrusæ et reconditæ doctrinæ indicia, pluresque subtiles et acutas, de circumcitione in deserto intermissa, disputationes et decisiones est videre.”

Against the passages above quoted, he refers in the margin to ‘Talm. Jevam. f. 72. 1.’ and ‘Tractat. Gitt. cap. 3.’

* We have been assured by a Jewish priest, that he never knew an instance where the wound was not completely healed in three days. As the rite is now administered, it is much more painful and severe than the simple ordinance established by the Almighty. The mother could hardly be fit to travel before the third day, therefore the child would be equal to pursue the journey as soon as the parent.—EDITOR.

This reason for the omission is too fanciful to be satisfactory. But the quotation may be useful, as shewing the opinion of the Jews, that the omission did not arise from wickedness, and a spirit of disobedience.

The passage from Shuckford is as follows :

What occasioned this neglect is not said expressly, but it is easy to guess. The covenant which the Israelites made with God in Horeb, was to do and observe all the things which the Lord should command them; and they were to be strictly careful not to make anything a rite of their religion which the Lord commanded them not. Therefore, though God had ordered Abraham to circumcise himself and children, and to enjoin his posterity to use this rite, yet when God was giving the Israelites a new law, in the manner which he now did by the hand of Moses, I think they could not warrantably take any rite, how ancient or usual, as a part of it, unless God himself gave them a command for it. God indeed had given them a law for circumcision; for we find it among the laws given after the death of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron. . . . As the law for circumcision required the males to be circumcised at eight days old, and was not given until the second year of the exit, when there must have been in the camp great numbers of children uncircumcised, who were past the day of age at which this rite was appointed to be performed, great matter of doubt must have arisen, when or how these were to be put under the law; and the Israelites not receiving directions from God how to proceed herein, was, I think, the reason that they stood still in this matter.

He then observes —

The critics and annotators abound in assigning reasons for the omission of circumcision in which the Israelites had lived hitherto, (Vid. *Pool. Synopsis. Critic.* in loc.) but I think they are not happy in assigning the true one.

I have not Poole's Synopsis to refer to; but if the reasons there assigned are unsatisfactory, I do not think Dr. Shuckford has supplied the defect. The command to circumcise the male children on the eighth day was very plain; and although the Israelites had been under a difficulty in respect of children who were more than eight days old, and fearful of doing any thing respecting them without further directions, yet it is hardly possible to suppose that they required further directions in respect of those not already eight days old.

Although none of the reasons above assigned appear to me satisfactory, yet I cannot but think a satisfactory reason for the omission existed. For, first, it does not appear that God at any time expressed any disapprobation of the omission: yet, if he did disapprove of it, it seems strange that he should, neither in respect of Moses nor of the people, have marked his displeasure in any way, especially considering, that if the omission met with his displeasure, it was an almost daily offence. Again, it is singular, and hardly to be conceived, that a *whole* people should have neglected a positive rite commanded them, without some assurance of its performance not being required—that not *one* should have been found who obeyed the commandment in this particular; and yet no record of God, or Moses his servant, enforcing it, or expressing displeasure at its neglect.

If the omission arose from religious fears of offending ignorantly, as Dr. Shuckford argues, it seems natural to suppose, that in such case God, if he wished to enforce the command, would have instructed Moses farther on the subject, that he might dissipate the people's

fears. If it arose from the climate, as the Cabalists conjecture, or from their migratory state, as Dr. Patrick supposes, with Father Lamy, then, as the Israelites were placed in that climate by God, and their migratory state was of his appointment, the omission might be supposed to be sanctioned by these circumstances. Of some of the laws given to Moses it is said, "These are the statutes, which ye shall observe and do when ye come into the land which I give you;" but it is not so said of the circumcision.

I do not pretend to offer any reason for the omission of this rite; but thinking, for the reasons mentioned, some satisfactory excuse did exist for the omission, I will, on this supposition, proceed to notice, shortly, your correspondent Llewellyn's question.

Supposing a sufficient excuse to exist for the omission, Moses' not enforcing the letter of the commandment appears to me perfectly consistent with his legal character. Thus, in his legal character, his duty was to enforce the commandments of God; but where God himself remitted or excused the performance, it was as plainly the duty of Moses his servant to acquiesce in the remission of the duty. And, in respect of his typical character, if we call to mind our Saviour's words in answer to the Jews, in reference to the observation of the Jewish sabbath, which he quoted out of their own scriptures, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," I think Moses' not enforcing circumcision (on the supposition I have made) will appear perfectly consistent with his typical character; for his not enforcing it under such circumstances was but an application and exemplification of the principle our Saviour referred to in vindication of his conduct.

In respect of Joshua: — when we recollect what our Saviour said, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it;" that it became him "to fulfil all righteousness;" how he charged the Jews with rendering the word of God of none effect by their traditions, and enforced the observance of the commandments to the full extent of their import and meaning; it will not, I think, appear inconsistent with the typical character of Joshua, that he should be the minister of reviving a commandment of God which had been long neglected.

Christ himself submitted to circumcision; it was very consistent therefore for any one who was a type of him to enforce the observance of it.

Christ was to abolish circumcision, but not in his life-time, on earth. If he were to be the minister of its being abrogated, it was the duty of every ruler preceding him to maintain it. In its abrogation, therefore, no one could be a type of him; for to abrogate it were not to be a type of him, but the doing of the very thing in his stead.

U. Y.

With regard to Llewellyn's observation, it may be said, that the former part of it is not necessarily true. It seems, indeed, to arise out of the words (Josh. v. 5), "Now all the people, that came out were circumcised," connected with the institution of the rite, as described Gen. xvii. and with the allusion to its existence, Gen. xxxiv. 22, where the Shechemites are exhorted to follow the example of Israel and his household. But as, on the one hand, we have no positive

declaration, that the ordinance was correctly maintained, in subsequent times, previous to the appearance of Moses; so, on the other, there is some reason for inferring the contrary from the negligence of Moses in his own family. With this in view, apparently, there have been writers, Tertullian amongst the number, who held that Moses, on his return into Egypt, impressed with the vital importance of performing the conditions of the covenant, actually renewed amongst the Israelites the practice of this rite, which, by lapse of time, had fallen into irregularity or disuse. As Scripture is silent on the subject, this must be looked upon only as a matter of probable conjecture. If it should be allowed to possess any weight, it will be so far beneficial as affording the best, and perhaps the only satisfactory mode of accounting for the injunction, (Josh. v. 2,) "circumcise again the children *the second time*."

To satisfy the minds of those who may not be prepared to admit the necessity, under any circumstances, of procrastinating a rite so obligatory, a reference is given to Numbers ix. 13, where even the celebration of the Passover is allowed to be deferred till a future occasion by those who are "*on a journey*," as well as by such as are under any legal disqualification. If it should be said, that Moses himself was precisely so situated, and yet that his life was spared only upon the instantaneous performance of the duty, it may be replied, that here was a case of previous neglect which required to be atoned for by immediate reparation.

With respect to the second query, it might, perhaps, be enough to reply, that we cannot justly be called upon to reconcile every type in all its parts, with known occurrences in the life and conduct of the antitype. We should, in fact, be assuming, that we possess much more knowledge on the subject than really falls to our lot. If this does not satisfy, it should be considered further, that the initiatory rite, of which Joshua was ordained the minister on this occasion, was the corresponding one to that of baptism under the Christian dispensation. Is it not then sufficiently significant, that he should be set to revive and renew the federal act of the dispensation under which he lived, as being a type of the greater *Joshua*, the Saviour, whose covenant was to have for its federal act the rite of baptism? The question, indeed, as it is stated, seems to lead to this, that Joshua would have acted more agreeably to his typical character, had he been made the instrument of abrogating circumcision. But there would be an evident fallacy in arguing so, for it would be putting the type in place of the antitype, and confusing their respective offices, not to mention that it would be making Joshua, a zealous Jew, transgress, in a most essential point, "the righteousness which is in the law." K.

We have not indeed any distinct account of the permission being granted: but the solemn warning which Moses had received for his neglect of this rite upon a former occasion, must have made him more especially careful not to expose himself a second time to a similar reproach.

The circumstances, moreover, under which the Israelites were placed in the wilderness, afford abundant reason for believing, that such a

dispensation from a part of the ceremonial law, should have been allowed by the Almighty. It is said, Numb. xiv. 34, that they were doomed to wander forty years in the wilderness, on account of the iniquity of their fathers. Whilst, therefore, they laboured under this edict, they might have been excluded from bearing on their bodies the badge of the covenant which God had made with them. “ *Tantis per igitur, dum expiata nondum esset illa defectionis culpa, circumcisio celebrari non debebat, quæ erat gratiæ Divinæ reconciliatio quædam.*”*

The Passover was only celebrated once† by the Israelites, during the time which elapsed from their departure out of Egypt till their arrival in Canaan; viz. at the erection of the tabernacle at the foot of Mount Sinai. And the same causes which would operate against the due observance of that solemn feast, during their harassing and painful journey, would apply *à fortiori* to the rite of circumcision.

But when they had reached the land of promise, these causes ceased to exist. It pleased God, therefore, that the dispensation which he had granted for a time, should cease also. His ordinances were now to be observed “ in the regular way:”‡ and the Passover which his people were now commanded, by the mouth of Joshua, to celebrate, was to be preceded, according to the provisions of the law, by that of circumcision.

The reasons which I have mentioned are sufficient, in my opinion, to account for the non-observance of that rite in the wilderness; and Joshua might surely be the minister appointed to revive it, without at all infringing upon the character which he bore as the type of Jesus. The leader of the hosts of Israel was clearly a type of the Messiah, both in name and office; and as such, he bore the strongest possible testimony to the divine authority of his office, by being the appointed minister to revive that sacred rite, which was the seal of those promises to be accomplished in the person of his great Antitype. That great Captain of our Salvation, who hath opened unto his faithful soldiers a way of approach, not to an earthly and temporal, but to the heavenly and eternal Canaan, did most assuredly *abrogate* the ceremonial law, but not until he had, in his own person, *fulfilled* it. He took upon him the form of man; and in that form submitted to that very rite which Joshua is here commanded to renew. During his ministry upon earth, he scrupulously obeyed every obligation of that law, of which he most emphatically declared, that “ one jot or one tittle should not pass away till all was fulfilled.” In the appointment of Joshua, therefore, to revive the rite of circumcision, there is nothing which does not perfectly accord with his being the type of Christ, who was “ made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law;” and who, “ in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.”

Brighton, April 5, 1827.

C.

* Vide *Masium apud Poli Syn. Crit. in loc.*

† We are not aware of any satisfactory authority for this assertion. In Numb. ix. 1—5, we have a repetition of the divine command for its observance, and a record of the second celebration of it. Why should we expect the subsequent observance of it to be noticed?—ED.

‡ *Stackhouse, in loc.*

CONFIRMATION.

FROM THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL WATCHMAN.

The white-robed Bishop stood amid a crowd—
 Noviciates all—who, tutored to revere
 The mitre's holy offices, drew near,
 And, after sins renounced, and pledges vowed,
 Pale with emotion and religious fear,
 In meek subjection, round the chancel, bowed,
 To hallored hands, that o'er them, one by one,
 Fell, with a Prelate's thrilling benison.
 Thou, who canst make the loadstone's* touch impart
 An active virtue to the tempered steel,
 Oh let Thy hand rest on them till they feel
 A new-born impulse stirring in the heart,
 And, springing from surrounding objects, free,
 Point, with a tremulous confidence, to Thee !

ASAPH.

ON THE APPLICATION OF THE TERM "CONSCIENTIOUS," TO
THOSE WHO DENY THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

MANY things have happened of late, necessarily tending to bring the case of those who deny the Divinity of our Lord, into frequent and public discussion. It is not intended in the present remarks to enter into the controversy between these dissenters and the orthodox members of the Church of England; but simply to inquire a little into the propriety of the complimentary language, which too many of the latter have come lately to adopt when speaking of the former. By degrees, it has grown into quite a usual and fashionable mode of expression, to talk and write about *conscientious* Socinians, until really one of the most venerable words in our language has lost all its distinctive meaning, and has ceased almost to be a term of commendation. We have an old proverb,—it is enough for a man to say "on my conscience" once a year,—and it would be well if, in this respect as well as in many other things, we could revive a little or more than a little of the spirit of our ancestors, and show at least so much respect to the most solemn ideas, as not to trifle with the words that convey them. And it is greatly to be hoped that, as it is likely much will soon be said and written with respect to this class of dissenters, those whose opinions are in unison with the doctrine of the Church of England, of the true Church in all ages, and above all, of the uncorrupted word of God, will pause and consider well before they go on to speak familiarly and even favourably of the persons who oppugn these on main points; just as if the truths we differ about were of slight importance; or, as if the evidence for them were insufficient; or, as if God had made a revelation without caring whether

* The Union of Christians to Christ, their common head; and by means of the influence which they derive from Him, one to another; may be illustrated by the Loadstone. It not only attracts the particles of iron to itself, by the magnetic virtue; but, by this virtue, it unites them one among another.—*Cecil's Remains.*

men received it or no. It is not intended here to insinuate, that harsh or unkind language can be justified either towards Socinians or any other sort of heretics whatsoever. There is but one feeling, and but one tone of language which can become men of a truly Christian spirit, even towards the worst offenders,—an *unaffected* feeling and tone of sorrow and pity. But soothing language cannot be unaffected; it must be mere matter of course, when addressed to persons whom we consider at the same time in the most glaring errors, and whom we know to be opposed to those truths upon which all the grand doctrines, privileges, and hopes of Christianity are hung. All then, that has hitherto been asserted, amounts to this: that, although we may on no account speak of these dissenters in terms of abuse, we must not address them in language of respect and honour, which belongs only to true Christian believers. We ought to be mild and gentle towards them in stile as well as conduct; but we ought not to go out of the old way, to pass a compliment upon them, which, if we are serious and well-grounded in our own belief, we cannot conceive to be their due.

That we ought not, when speaking of those who deny the Divinity of Christ, to call them *conscientious* men, is maintained on the following reasons:

In the first place, believing as orthodox Christians do believe; the union of the ideas,—“conscientious” and “Socinian,”—is inconsistent; at least, in all those cases where men have before them the unadulterated Word of God. We consider, that our faith is gathered not by any occasional or difficult inferences from the Bible; but, that it is often and plainly laid down there, to such a degree, that we do not see how it is possible to read Holy Scripture sincerely and diligently, without being convinced of it. We know, too, by history, and by their yet remaining works, that the great body of Christians of every period, called the Church, has come to the same conclusion. Further than this, we perceive, from the very first, the strongest and clearest cautions given us against all opinions that call in question the divine nature of our Lord; and we read, that such persons as maintained them were put, time after time as they arose, under the denomination of heretics. Now, can it be, that persons who deny, and who often deride, what we and the holy Catholic Church generally have deemed to be the essentials of Christianity, can do so from the dictates of conscience? If this were possible, should we not expect to find in the Bible, intimations of such a possibility? Would not so strange a case as this have been supposed, and provided for there? Or, should we find, as we now find, all the texts which allude to such persons, speaking nothing but the language of reprobation against them? There is nothing in Scripture, or in the practice of the Church, or in reason, when properly influenced by these, which will warrant any softening reflections connected with the heresy of Socinianism; there is nothing to bear us out in mixing up those heterogeneous ideas, which have lately, like oil and water, been forced together—conscientious unbelievers. The way in which we have fallen into this abuse of language is this: Among the men of science and public character, there have been several of late years, who unhappily have favoured these false and mischievous views; their reputation in other respects has been

allowed to cover their faults in this. They have mixed with men of a purer faith, more bent upon science than religion: the heretic has made himself admired and useful; the orthodox Christian has been captivated with the man, and shamed out of his own principles; at least, shamed from upholding them, and disowning the contrary as he ought: and thus, an undue compromise has taken place;—in fact, under the pursuit of knowledge, and a vague idea of religion generally, Christianity has been forgotten. It is an exact accomplishment of an Apostle's fears;—“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ; for in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” But surely there is no cause that an abuse, which has sprung from lukewarmness and forgetfulness, should keep us forgetful and lukewarm for ever. It is time that we began again to speak the words of *truth* as well as soberness; and that, in religion as well as in other matters, we should assort our ideas, and become something more consistent in our combination of them. The light of knowledge, which these very men have helped to bring into the world, as far as it is true knowledge, will teach us a better lesson, and convince us of the utter absurdity of talking any longer in that censurable tone of compromise towards the enemies of revealed truth, which is as inaccurate as it is unsafe.

And this is a second reason against the employment of that loose and over-liberal sort of language of which we are speaking, that it cannot but be attended with very fatal effects upon the minds of better disposed Christians in general. If they see, that even those who may be supposed to have studied the question most, and to whom they are in the habit of looking up with respect and deference, do not hesitate to imply, and occasionally to express an opinion, that men with their Bibles in their hands, and with sincerity in their hearts, may yet entirely miss the very fundamentals of Christianity; what can be the result, but to lead them to adopt the inference, that Scripture is not so clear, that we ourselves are not so certain upon these points, as we pretend? In short, must they not suppose, that it is an arrant mistake to say, that these doctrines are essential to Christianity? There cannot, indeed, be any doubt in the minds of those who consider the matter impartially, that this way of palliating unbelief or disbelief, must have this evil influence upon the mass of believers; and that, in point of fact, in proportion as learned and leading men in religion have written and spoken remissly, with regard to serious errors of faith, the faith itself has been shaken, and people have become afraid of nothing so much as of believing any thing too firmly. Is this holding fast the form of sound words? Is this, or is it not, the being ashamed of the Gospel of Christ? Is this to show, in doctrine, uncorruptness, gravity, sincerity, sound speech that cannot be condemned? Is this likely to shame those of the contrary part, or those on our own and on the truth's side?

It cannot but be evident, that the effect must be harmful, and seriously harmful, to the Church and society at large; but we may venture to go a step further, and to assert, as a third reason against the giving into this sort of stile, that it is quite the reverse of charitable

towards Socinians themselves. Where is the kindness of flattering men in gross error? Where is the appearance of a Christian spirit, in softening down their unbelief, when we have such reason to think that if persisted in, it will be their ruin? What sort of love is that which would strive to keep men's eyes shut to their own worst faults? which would help to persuade them, that they are influenced by conscience, when we have the greatest cause to fear that they are deficient in simplicity, humility, and fairness of mind? It is a strange charity, in short, which thinks to gain men over to the truth, by using such language as implies that they are safe in their error; or which, at all events, tends to lull them into security in that sort of infidelity, against which the word of God directs some of its most tremendous threatenings. Surely there is a stile of deep and hearty concern for those who are in such a responsible and hazardous condition, that far better becomes the truth, and is far more consistent with charity, than such sort of language, which betrays at once our own lukewarmness, and half surrenders the cause of the Gospel; which endangers, it is hard to say whether most, the salvation of our brethren, or of unbelievers.

If there is any justice in the foregoing remarks, it is high time that they should be considered, and practically illustrated by those to whom in a good measure, under Providence, the defence of the Gospel, and the restraint of infidelity is committed. It is high time that they should come before the world, not "puffed up" with a spirit of rancour against the enemies of truth, but "builded up" for a firm and unyielding maintenance of it themselves. They must not quit the high ground, the rock, on which the Church has stood for ages; and from which, guided by the inspiration of its divine Founder, it has spoken with consistent authority, the main articles of our faith, and rebuked with a holy effect the vain imaginations of men who think more highly of themselves than they ought to think. It is not a case for conciliation or concession, but for grave remonstrance and censure. A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself. If, unmercifully, church censures are now of no avail, let churchmen, at least, 'keep up the spirit of the institution in their own minds, and in their language to the world. Let them, whatever imputation be laid against them, not shrink from maintaining with one Apostle, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God;" and with another, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha." And let them, to their establishment in the present truth, remember who has said, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

U. A. I.

ON THE RIGHT OF THE ORDINARY TO THE DISPOSAL OF
CHANCEL SEATS.

MR. EDITOR.—SOME time since, I met with an observation in one of the numbers of your valuable *Miscellany*, respecting the right of persons to pews in Churches, which struck me as not being agreeable to the spirit, or letter, of the ecclesiastical law. On that occasion, I

was anxious to have stated to your correspondent my reasons for venturing to differ from him in opinion. But absence from home, and consequent separation from books of reference, caused me to relinquish the idea.

Again I take up your interesting publication, when I am similarly circumstanced; and again I am a dissentient from the reasoning of a correspondent of yours, the title of whose letter is, "On the Right of the Ordinary to the Disposal of Chancel Seats."* So satisfied, indeed, am I, that the argument of your correspondent is erroneous; so possessed am I with a conviction, that the error into which he has fallen is of considerable magnitude and great practical importance, that I no longer forbear addressing you, and requesting that you will give insertion to this letter, in reply to the communication from Milbrook. My chief object is, to draw the attention of your literary friends to the points at issue; points which they who have the best means of coming to a correct conclusion, will be most willing to allow have not hitherto undergone that investigation, or received that notice, even from respectable professional gentlemen, which they merit. Your able correspondent from Milbrook, whose name is so creditably known to, and so highly respected by, the studious of our day, will pardon the liberty I take in thus differing from him, and will goodnaturedly set me right if I am wrong.

Allow me then to ask, whether or not I am correct in supposing—

1st. That, in our places of worship, the chancel, as well as the church, is for the service of Almighty God; and that, in the erection of both, the accommodation of the parishioners *generally* is contemplated.

2dly. That at first,—I mean previously to the Reformation,—pews or sitting-places in churches and chancels were free to all the parishioners, without distinction or preference; but that, to avoid confusion or litigation, the churchwarden, who is the officer of the ordinary, was appointed to allot separate pews to particular individuals, according to their rank.

3dly. By degrees, from the unwillingness of churchwardens to disturb parties in possession, such parties claimed and acquired a title to the pews they occupied, still with certain limitations and restrictions. For instance, in all cases, when persons leave a parish, any interest they may have in pews ceases, for pews can only belong to parishioners. Again, when the messuage to which a pew is attached goes to decay, and is pulled down, the right terminates;† for the right is not personal. It does not follow an individual from residence to residence; it is always, in fact, confined to a particular messuage on a particular estate. Again, should the occupiers of a dwelling-house, to which a pew is attached, become Roman Catholics or Dissenters, and discontinue their attendance at the church, they cannot lock up their pew, or usurp the office of the churchwarden, by seating others therein.‡ The unoccupied pew reverts to the ordinary, as the only legal disposer

* Vide number for June, pp. 368, 369.

† Of course a house might be *rebuilt* without affecting the right in question.

‡ The idea that pews in parish churches may be let or sold very generally prevails, but it is a gross error.

thereof, to be by him bestowed on the most proper applicant. Were it otherwise, in those parishes where the bulk of the property is in the hands of Dissenters, they might render the parish church in a great degree useless, by refusing to persons of the established religion admittance into their pews. The policy of the ordinary very naturally is to recur, as much and as often as possible, to first principles in the distribution of pews and sitting-places; for all exclusive rights originated in gradual usurpation, and it was never contemplated, by our Norman and Saxon ancestors, that any one should exclude all others from any part of the house of God. It was their object, that admittance into our sacred edifices should be common to all, high and low, rich and poor.* In many parishes, large estates and baronial properties have, in progress of time, become divided and subdivided, and newly-erected mansions have spread themselves over the ground, occupied by respectable and enlightened Protestants, desirous of attending divine worship in their parish churches. Pews, therefore, should revert, as in strictness they do much oftener than is imagined, to the ordinary, that he may be able to allot them afresh, and re-arrange the order of precedence, according to existing circumstances.

4thly. There are only two methods of acquiring a title to a pew to the exclusion of the ordinary's jurisdiction; viz. by a faculty, or by prescription, which supposes a faculty. And here I am sorry to observe, that culpable facilities have, in too many cases, been given by our ecclesiastical courts, to grants for faculties. In how many instances, to my knowledge, has the beauty of the fabric been defaced, the uniformity of the seats destroyed, and injury done to those most essential requisites, the power of hearing and of seeing; though, I am in duty bound to add, much greater attention has lately been paid to the subject, which has led to the most beneficial results.

5thly. The sole difference between the church and the chancel, with relation to the questions we are discussing, is, that the parishioners generally are liable to the repair of the former;† the rector, or impropriator, to that of the latter.‡ Formerly, however, the rector or impropriator repaired both. This he did by virtue of his tithes; and the reparation of the chancel, which still attaches to him, is retained as a tax upon him for those tithes—onus pro beneficio. But observe, it is the *fabric* of the chancel which he is bound to repair; not the altar; not the ornamental parts, such as painted glass, monuments, cushions, rails, &c.; not the pews, unless by custom.

6thly. When the rector repaired the church, it gave him no authority over the pews to the exclusion of the ordinary; how, then, by continuing to repair the chancel, has he acquired any paramount authority there?

If these general principles are allowed, does it not follow that your respected correspondent from Milbrook is mistaken in the argument by which he would exclude the ordinary from all jurisdiction over pews in the chancel?

* Look, for example, to the interior arrangement of churches in Roman Catholic countries.

† Unless when prescription is pleaded, which is founded on individual reparation.

‡ Pews may be prescribed for in the chancel equally as in the church.

His statement is as follows:

"The right to seats appears to depend upon the duty of repairing." Granted, with regard to exclusive rights.—"It is an acknowledged principle in cases of prescription for seats in general, that repair is a first point to be proved by the claimant." Indisputably.—"It is on this ground Watson argues the question." Not having Dr. Watson's work to refer to, I can only express my willingness to trust to your correspondent's correctness in quoting him.—"He does not merely, as Dr. Burn states, 'argue to the same purpose' as Gibson. He argues principally upon a supposed analogy between the case of the parishioners and that of the parson, with respect to the right of seats. His position is, that the repairing of the chancel by the parson cannot exclude the jurisdiction of the ordinary over the seats, because the parishioners repair the body of the church; and yet therein the disposal of the seats is notoriously in the ordinary. But this analogy will not hold good." From what I have stated above, it is evident that I am prepared to maintain, though not dogmatically, an opposite opinion. But, first, I will proceed to the conclusion of my opponent's argument. "The right of the seats in both cases," *i.e.* in the chancel as well as in the church, "is in those who repair. The ordinary has no right in the seats. He has a jurisdiction, but that jurisdiction is simply distributive. He cannot seat an inhabitant of another parish, who is not liable to the repairs of the church. He can only apportion the seats among those in whom the right of them is vested. A. B. and C. being liable to the repairs, the ordinary can distribute the seats among them; but he cannot give them to D. who is not liable to repairs." Allow me to differ from your correspondent. If D. is a parishioner, he must be seated by the churchwardens, without deference to any levies he may pay. The very idea, that D.'s power to attend his parish church can be made to depend upon a question of pounds shillings and pence, is revolting to my mind. Neither do I know what law sanctions such a presumption. "In the case of the parson who repairs the chancel, this distributive jurisdiction cannot operate: for the parson being one, there are no parties among whom the seats are to be distributed." There are places of worship in which the chancel is large enough to accommodate one or two hundred persons, and in which *many* parishioners actually do sit. What would they say, were they told, that "the parson being one, there are no parties among whom the seats are to be distributed?" Some would smile; others might express their dissent in a less courteous manner; but all would be aware there must be some fallacy in the position which led to such a conclusion, though they might not have turned their attention sufficiently to the ecclesiastical law, to detect where the error lay. Suffer me, then, to endeavour, to the best of my power, to argue the case for them.

The rector, or proprietor, in consideration of his liability to repairs, may choose the best pew in the chancel. The vicar also has a right to one. All others, who have faculty pews, or pews by prescription, have an equal right. But here all exclusion ends. From the fifth rule, it appears that the rector or proprietor is only bound to repair the *fabric* of the chancel, which at once destroys the

foundation on which your correspondent builds all his reasoning, and, if allowed, ends the discussion. Granting, however, for argument's sake, that the rector or impropriator is liable to repair the pews, how does he differ from a great landed proprietor, the amount of whose assessment may be so considerable as to impose upon him, in fact, the burthen of repairing more unappropriated pews in the body of the church than would fill the whole chancel? Can such a proprietor say, that, because he has so heavy a burthen of repairs devolving upon him, as great, perhaps, as any other twenty parishioners, he should have exclusive power over a proportionable share, say a twentieth part, of the whole number of sittings thus repaired? Your correspondent knows such an assumption on his part would be disallowed. He could only apply to the ordinary for one pew, or for room sufficient to accommodate his family. Neither, then, by analogy, could the claim of the rector or impropriator be supported, though his portion of the expense of repairing the pews in the chancel might be very great, might be the whole.* The allotment, in fact, does not depend upon property, and consequent liability to repairs in any given ratio, but rather on the number of inhabitants in a house, and their consequent want of accommodation.

Besides, such an exclusive jurisdiction, on the part of the rector, might lead to the worst of consequences. It is always wise to place the administration of the laws in independent hands, that they may be administered by persons beyond the reach of prejudice, or partiality, or local feelings of any kind. Suppose, then, the case of a rector, who had unfortunately quarrelled with a large body of his parishioners; a possible case, you will allow, though I pray to God it be not of frequent occurrence. Suppose, further, that his chancel was large, and filled with numerous seats; would it be right that he should have an *exclusive* power over those pews, and be enabled to dispossess any of the parties arbitrarily? Would it not be much more for the peace and quietness of the parish, and for the interests of the established religion, that reference might be made to the ordinary, whose sole object, in any arrangement he made, might fairly be presumed to be general convenience and unbiased justice?

On the whole, then, I must confess myself strongly of opinion, that the ordinary's jurisdiction over the pews in the chancel should not be restricted. You will perceive I have advanced three separate arguments to establish my position: in the first of which I raise a question, whether your correspondent has not mistaken the fabric of the chancel for the pews therein; in the second, I argue from analogy, contrasting the rector's claim with that of a large landed proprietor; in the third, I reason with a view to the interests of religion, and advert to the prejudicial consequences which might result from the establishment of the rector's jurisdiction to the exclusion of the ordinary.

This letter having already exceeded the limits within which I purposed confining it, I hasten to subscribe myself,

Mr. Editor, your obedient humble Servant,

J. T. L.

* The rector is discharged from contributing to the repairs of the church; the repairs of the chancel being coincident as his portion of the whole expense, in consideration of his property.

LAW REPORT.

VALIDITY OF RESIGNATION BONDS.

LORD SONDES v. FLETCHER.

THIS case, which involved a question of much interest and importance,—the validity of special resignation bonds,—has been decided by the House of Lords. The facts are, that Mr. Fletcher, upon being presented, by Lord Sondes, to the Rectory of Kettering, in Northamptonshire, gave a bond, in the penalty of 12000*l.* to resign the living upon request, so that the patron might be enabled to present thereto one of his two brothers therein named. Mr. Fletcher having refused to resign accordingly, Lord S. sued him upon the bond, and no defence being made, the damages were assessed at 12000*l.* the whole amount of the penalty. Mr. F. then appealed to the Exchequer Chamber, and afterwards to the House of Lords, when, after the case had been argued by counsel, the following question was put to the Judges, “Whether, either by the statute or the common law, the bond, upon which the action was brought, is void or illegal.” Nine of the Judges delivered their opinions *seriatim*. Abbott, Chief Justice; Alexander, Chief Baron; Park, Justice; and Graham, Garrow, and Hullock, Barons; that the bond was void; and Best, Chief Justice, and Burrough and Gazelee, Justices, that it was not. Bayley, Holroyd, and Littledale, Justices, not having heard the arguments of counsel, declined giving any opinion. The opinions of four of the Judges are reported fully in the British Critic for April last. Our space will not permit us to give them at equal length, but we propose to present our readers with a digested report of the reasoning and arguments of the learned persons, and conclude by stating the judgment of the House of Lords, as moved by Lord Chancellor Eldon.

We will first observe, that the House of Lords, as the supreme court, is not bound by the decisions of the inferior judicatures, but uses them only as affording arguments and principles. In the present case, it is unnecessary

for us to trouble our readers with a review of such decisions (which, indeed, favoured the validity of resignation bonds), for it was correctly said by Mr. Justice Buller, in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, *they are destitute of all sense, reason, and principle*. In the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, which was heard in the House of Lords in 1783, it was decided that a presentation is void which is made in consideration of a bond given by the presentee to the patron, by which the former binds himself to the latter absolutely to resign the living, on request made to him by the patron to make such resignation. The invalidity of *general* resignation bonds was thus decided by this case; and since that time, though special bonds have been commonly adopted, yet the question as to *their* validity was never pointedly and solemnly decided in any of the courts below. Lord Chancellor Eldon, indeed, during the course of his judicial career, never omitted an opportunity of expressing his opinion that they, special bonds, could not be supported upon any sound principle. Assuming, then, that the bond given by Mr. Fletcher was not affected by the decision in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, its validity was to be tried by the words of the statute and the principles of the common law. We allude to the statute 31 Eliz. c. 6. § 5, which was made to enforce a very clear rule in the ecclesiastical law, that presentations ought to be spontaneous; and enacts that if any person shall, for any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit, or for or by reason of any promise, agreement, bond, or other instrument, securing the same, present to a living, such presentation shall be void, the patron and presentee shall each forfeit the double value of one year's profit of the benefice, and the presentee shall also be incapable of holding the same.

The question then was, did the bond

given by Mr. Fletcher, in consideration of the presentation, secure to Lord Sondes "any sum of money, reward, gift, profit, or benefit."

It was urged that this being a penal law, must be construed strictly; that the general words, *profit or benefit*, must be restricted to profits or benefits *ejusdem generis* with money, rewards, or gifts, mentioned before, such as bills of exchange instead of money, leases of the tithes, or profits of the benefice, or loans of money, or other valuables, for a long or an indefinite period of time, instead of immediate gifts of the same thing. If this construction, it was said, be not put on the words, no patron, either lay or ecclesiastical, can present or collate a son, who is dependent on such patron, to any ferment in the church, without being guilty of simony. If a bond for the resignation of a living in favour of a son be a benefit, the presentation of a son to a vacant benefice must be a benefit, for the first is only a means of obtaining the second. That there could be no doubt that if a patron has a son whom he maintains, it is generally a benefit for him to have a living to which he can present such son; for few persons would allow a son as much after he was in possession of a benefice as he received before. But that this was not that corrupt benefit which was contemplated by the legislature when the statute was passed. That whatever expressions are to be found in the act, the object of the legislature was only to prevent simony, and such advantages as these were never thought to be simoniacial.

That in exchanges, each party proposes to himself some benefit; the one expects to get more profit, the other a more healthy, or agreeable, or advantageous situation; yet exchanges are expressly allowed by the Statute of Elizabeth.

That though a general resignation bond, being the means of procuring an immediate vacancy, may be a benefit to the patron if the benefice be sold during the incumbency, yet that such cannot be the case with respect to a special bond; for though, after a resignation, the patron may present whom he pleases, yet the Bishop, before accepting the resig-

nation, might require the presentation of the person mentioned in the special bond; that if a patron called on an incumbent to resign his benefice, to the intent and for the sole and only purpose that he might present A. B. in favour of whom the patron had a right to call on the incumbent to resign, and after having obtained the resignation by such false pretence, he presented C. D. for whom the bond did not authorise the patron to require a resignation, compensation for the injury the incumbent had sustained might be recovered in an action.

That though the resignation was enforced by a money penalty, which the patron might recover, yet such sum of money not being his object, it did not come within the meaning of the statute; that it was not consistent with justice or common sense, that a man should lose his right because his opponent compelled him, by a breach of his contract, to sue for a penalty he neither expected nor desired.

That the words *sponte, pure, et simpliciter*, are not essential to the oath of resignation. But that, if a resignation in this precise form were required, the only import of the words *sponte, pure, et simpliciter* is, that the clerk was not driven by unlawful violence, or threats, or seduced by any corrupt agreement, to make the resignation; but that he made it willingly, and because he thought it his duty to make it. With regard to the oath, it was admitted, that by Archbishop Courtney's decree, persons presented are required to swear, that "obligationem non sunt nec eorum amici pro se juratoria aut pecuniaria cautio de ipsis beneficiis resignandis." But, that these words are not in the oath prescribed by the Council of Westminster, 1138, or that of the Council of Oxford, 1236; that the insertion of them by the archbishop into the oath required by his decree, shews, that he, and those who advised him, thought that the oaths previously taken did not reach resignation bonds. That the archbishop had no authority to alter the oath; and that if any bishop was now to refuse to admit a clerk who declined taking this oath, he would render himself liable to damages, and the costs of a *quare*

impedit. "By altering oaths of office," observed Best, Chief Justice, you may alter the condition, duties, and responsibilities of the officers. Parliament only can do this in civil offices and councils of the clergy, with the approbation of the king, in ecclesiastical."

By the common law, an incumbent, by virtue of institution and induction, acquires an estate for life; not from the patron, but from the ordinary—the patron has merely the right of nomination. That is, the whole of the *jus patronatus*. But it was said, this constitutes no objection to a bond to resign, for the condition to resign in the case of a benefice forms no part of the instrument that creates the interest in it; it is made by a separate deed. If a tenant for life were to give a bond, to convey back his estate on the happening of a particular event, such a bond would not be voidable at law. That no two estates are less like each other than that of a clerk in his benefice and a lay tenant for life; they are created with different objects; conditions are annexed to one which are not annexed to the other: the clergyman, to preserve his estate, must perform the duties of his church; if he takes another benefice without a dispensation, he vacates the other.

As to the propriety and the policy of holding resignation bonds illegal, it was said:—

"That the holding of this bond illegal and void would be a breach of national faith to those who have been induced to purchase advowsons;" for, said Best, C. J., "immense sums of money have been expended in buying advowsons and presentations, upon the highest assurance next to that of an express declaration by the legislature, that in cases of livings becoming vacant before those on whom the purchasers intended to bestow them are capable of taking orders, they might present to such livings, and take the security of a bond from the presentees for the resignation of them, when the person for whom they are intended shall be in priest's orders. Many of these purchasers have no other provision for their children but the living so purchased. Ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, have dealt in these bonds of resignation. Lord

Mansfield said, a bishop of Salisbury, before his (Lord M.'s) time, frequently took them. This was not said of that right reverend prelate by way of reproach, but to shew that men of the highest character did not consider that the taking such bonds was improper.

"Your lordships," continued the learned chief justice, "will permit me to remind you, that if these bonds are within the statute of Elizabeth, you make those who have given, and those who have taken them criminals.

"Both the plaintiff and the defendant, and many other persons, as well clergymen as laymen, have, whilst acting under the sanction of the courts of Westminster, committed the scandalous crime of simony, and subjected themselves to all the penalties of the statute of Elizabeth. I am aware, my Lords, that this argument was answered in the *Bishop of London v. Ffytche*, by saying, that these consequences of the judgment could be prevented by an Act of Parliament; your Lordships cannot have forgotten the answer of Lord Mansfield to this observation. 'What! pass a judgment to do mischief, and then bring in a bill to cure it?' I will add, Will you condemn men by a judgment that has all the vice of an *ex post facto* law, and after confiscating their property, save them from further punishment by a statute pardon?"

That presentations are not pure spiritual trusts; if they had been so considered, the bishops could not have allowed them to be disposed of by laymen: advowsons in gross, or next presentations, could never have been permitted to be sold; archbishops could not leave options to their widows or other lay persons. The learned Selden, it was observed, calls the right of lay patrons to present to livings, "the interest of patronage which the lay founders challenged in their newly erected churches." That Lord Kenyon calls a right of presentation, "a trust connected with an interest." That laymen, when they endowed churches, reserved the right of patronage, and the right of taking resignation bonds in favour of their children and descendants. That the bishops, by allowing the dedication of tithes to be

made on these conditions, obtained a provision for many churches which would otherwise have remained without endowment. That the consequences of declaring these bonds void, will not be confined to the injury done to the long established rights of patrons. It will introduce a laxity in the mode of construing penal statutes, that will deprive persons accused of crimes of the benefit of that humane rule, which secures from punishment all whose offences are not clearly within the letter as well as the spirit of the law. The judgments of the Courts of Westminster Hall are the only authority that we have by far the greatest part of the laws of England. The overturning of the long series of judgments, which declares the validity of these bonds, must introduce uncertainty and confusion into every part of the common law. "Can it be said," asked Best, C. J. "that the law which governs these bonds is unjust? No, my Lords, the injustice is in destroying, without compensation, a vested right. Can it be said, that they are inconsistent with the policy of our laws? That policy encourages us to provide for our children, relations, and friends, and allows us to bestow on them offices for which they are duly qualified. In ecclesiastical benefices the public have a security for the fitness of the person presented, which does not exist in other cases. The bishops are to take care that neither friendship, nor natural affection, puts a clerk into a church who is not duly qualified to do the duties of it. If a patron may give a living to his son, or relation, or friend, what objection is there, if it becomes vacant, when the person for whom it is intended is incapable of taking it, to his permitting some other person to hold it until the incapacity of the first object of his choice be removed? It has been said, this can be done in the case of no other office. There are no other offices that have been created by the patrons, and endowed out of their estates; and, therefore, there could be no legal origin for the right to take such bonds in any other offices. With respect to other offices; there are no judicial authorities to support such a

right. Your Lordships will not suppose, that the holding these bonds to be void, you will make patrons forget their families, and look out, unbiassed by affection or friendship, for the most worthy clergyman to fill the vacant benefice. Many of them will act, as some patrons have done, where a living, the presentation to which they are desirous of selling, becomes void before it is sold: they will present some old man. By which are the duties of an incumbent likely to be best performed—a young man in full health, under a bond of resignation; or an old man, who has just enough of life left not to be liable to be objected to by a bishop, on account of his imbecility?

"Many owners of manors, with advowsons annexed, will sell the advowsons from the manors. Those who pay large sums of money to purchase advowsons in gross, will not be the most likely persons to hold such advowsons as pure trusts; and in disposing of them, look only to the maxim, *detur digniori*. Such alienations of the church patronage will break the connexion between the landed interest and the clergy. The young men of family are, from their education and habits, likely to make the best parish priests; from their connexion with the owners of the lands in the parishes, all the inhabitants feel a respect for them, which must add much to the effect of the instruction they give. Connexion with the proprietors of the soil gives to the clergyman the greatest interest in the happiness of his parishioners, and stimulates him to promote their spiritual welfare. Such persons will not take orders where the livings, which their ancestors founded, are severed from their families. I am aware these are rather considerations of policy than law. But, my Lords, if there be any doubts what is the law, judges solve such doubts, by considering what will be the good or bad effects of their decision. I say, nearly in the words of one of the bishops, in the *Bishop of London v. Fytche*, 'that doctrine cannot be law which injures the rights of individuals, and will be productive of evil to the church and to the community.'

The learned judges who argued that the bond was illegal and void, contended:

That a resignation bond did secure a profit or benefit to the patron, in the true spirit and intentment of the statute. If the bond be valid, Lord Sondes would be entitled to recover 12,000*l.* and costs. A right to enforce the payment of such a sum looks like a profit, or a benefit. The opportunity thus afforded, of providing for a son, or a brother, or other relation, must surely be considered as a benefit to the patron. If it be a benefit, how has it been acquired? why, by means of a corrupt bargain for the presentation. In a word, he that stipulates for a resignation bond, bargains for a sum of money, or for that which to him is as valuable, or perhaps more valuable than that sum of money. Either of them is beneficial to him; both of them, therefore, forbidden by the statute.

That in exchanges, neither living can be considered as better or worse in legal intentment, because they are, in the estimation of those that make them, perfectly equal, however other persons may differ on the subject. Mr. Baron Eyre puts the case thus: "A living in the air of Berkshire may be reckoned an equivalent for the difference in value of an incumbency in the hundreds of Essex." That is a fair argument. Each man throws into the scale circumstances which establish a perfect equilibrium in cases of exchange between parties. Although there is not a single shilling passing, yet if there is any other extrinsic benefit whatsoever, to the smallest amount, it is made a part in the consideration of such exchange; and there is no question, that upon the act of Elizabeth, such exchange is void.

That by means of such a bond, a benefice may be sold during an actual vacancy. The value is calculated, a bond is given for the amount, to be void if the incumbent resigns on request, when a certain specified individual is capable of holding the living. That event happens almost immediately, by the nomination of a person who, if he lived, would within a very few months be capable of

taking the benefice; and the patron becomes entitled, either to the penalty or the presentation. If, it was said, a bond be good for brothers, why may it not also be good in favour of cousins or more remote kindred, or of friends? If it be allowed in favour of two persons, why may it not be allowed in favour of more than two? — of twelve, of twenty, or even a greater number? That there was no principle upon which it might be said, "thus far shalt thou go, but no farther."

That if a general bond be a benefit to the patron, and therefore simoniacal and void, how is a special bond to be distinguished? If it be a benefit to a patron, to be able to call for a resignation whenever he may choose to present any other person, it is equally a benefit, though perhaps a less benefit, to be able to command a resignation, in order to present a relation or friend; and if there be any benefit, the degree of benefit must be immaterial, and the case will be equally within the statute: that there is, in fact, no difference in principle between general and special bonds. "Suppose," said Hullock, baron, "a clerk should resign, in conformity to the condition of a bond of this sort; what obligation is there upon the obligee, to present the individual specified in the condition? — None. He may give the living to a stranger; and if the patron should present a stranger to the living, would the obligor have any remedy, either at law or equity, against the obligee, for the nonrepresentation of the nomine in the bond? I should be curious to learn the precise species of remedy or redress to which an obligor would, under such circumstances, be entitled. Again, there is no obligation upon the nomine to accept the living if it should be offered to him."

That it is not only required by the ecclesiastical laws, that a benefice shall be freely given and freely taken, but if resigned, it must be freely and voluntarily resigned; *non metu coactus sed sponte voluntate*; and how can a resignation be voluntary which is made in order to avoid the penalty of a bond, whether a patron has a right to impose the penalty at his pleasure,

or only for a particular purpose? "And ought," asked Abbot, chief justice, "the law to sanction an instrument that places a clergyman in a situation, either to subject himself to a demand which he may be unable to pay, or to make a solemn declaration contrary to his conscience and to truth?"

That since the acceptance by the ordinary is necessary to give effect to the resignation, the undertaking of a clerk to resign a benefice is an undertaking which he has no power of himself to perform.

That, considering the estate which a clerk has in his benefice, an estate for life, it is inconsistent with the principles of common law, that the patron, from whom such estate is not derived, should be permitted to exact a security by which his estate may be reduced to a mere tenancy at will. For though when a nominee in a special bond becomes capable of holding the benefice, the patron may, yet he is not obliged to demand the resignation. Then the obligor is a mere tenant at will to the obligee. If he be allowed to retain the living, he would do so by the permission of the patron, and he would hold it on the tenure of the patron's mere will and pleasure. And if the law will not allow a benefice to be held absolutely at the will of the patron, and voidable whenever he may choose to present any other person, neither will it endure that a benefice be so held as to be voidable when a relation or friend of the patron, may be capable of taking it, and the patron may think fit to present him; for in each case the estate of the incumbent would be less than a freehold: but our law always considers a benefice as a freehold, whatever it may have been in its origin, or first constitution; all traces of which are now lost in the obscurity of antiquity. In short, that it was impossible for any one to contend, that a bond which places an incumbent in such complete thraldom, under so absolute a dominion and restraint, could be supported upon any known or recognised principle of law. That such a bond must necessarily operate to the prejudice, if not the total subversion, of the true and essential interests of religion.

That it might be objected to special bonds, on the ground of public policy, that the patron may thereby be precluded from choosing the most proper individual for supplying the living. If he act in the presentation according to the condition of the bond, his choice is fixed long before the fitness of the object can be ascertained. At the execution of the bond the nominee may be at college, or perhaps at school, or perhaps in his cradle.

HOUSE OF LORDS, APRIL 9.

APPEALS—FLETCHER V. LORD SONDES.

SIMONY—FINAL JUDGMENT.

The Lord Chancellor (Eldon) having gone through all the circumstances of the case, observed that the appellant, on bringing the case into the Court of Exchequer Chamber, had set forth the errors, and the respondent pleaded in *nullo est erratum*. The court perceiving that there were none of these errors on record, which could warrant them to enter into the merits of the case, affirmed the judgment, without hearing the arguments of counsel. The question now for the consideration of their lordships was, whether this was a bond on which the parties were entitled to sue; and in coming to a conclusion on this subject, their lordships should consider themselves as judges in a court of justice, and his (the Lord Chancellor's) duty was not to state the case on any other ground than that which was warranted by law. His lordship had not the slightest hesitation in saying, that before the decision given in the case of the Bishop of London against Fyfche, this bond would be held legal, but he was of opinion that it came within the same principle which governed that decision. It was argued by counsel at the bar, that this bond could not be considered simoniacal, as the condition of the resignation was the presentation of a particular person, and that the obligee might see, and the Bishop should take care, that on his resignation, no other person should be presented but the Rev. Henry Watson, the brother of Lord Sondes. Now, if the resignation were conditional, it would cease to be a resigna-

tion at all, and after an incumbent had resigned, he (the Lord Chancellor) would ask any man conversant in law or equity, was there any law upon earth which could compel a patron to present any particular person? It had already been decided in several instances, that a resignation, to be good, must be *pura et absque conditione*, otherwise the law said it was no resignation, or it was void. True it was that two or three eminent and distinguished leading characters were adverse to the decision in the case of the Bishop of London and Ffytche, among whom was Lord Kenyon, to whose opinion in legal matters he paid the highest respect, and it was consequently urged, that that decision should govern no other case, except that which was strictly in point; but his lordship thought that there was nothing in this case which should take it out of the rule by which that decision was governed. The Bishop of London and Ffytche was bond of general resignation, and if the incumbent resigned in this case, could not the patron present whom he pleased; and how then did it differ from a bond of general resignation? It had been urged that if this bond should be judged simoniacial, the incumbent and the patron would be subject to heavy penalties; but it was their lordships' business not to attend to any thing but to the subject proposed for their consideration. How could they with propriety pronounce against the law to avoid the consequences of an illegal act? When his lordship looked to the cases in the books which were advanced in support of this judgment, he should say they were not well considered. One of them said, that a bond of resignation might be made in favour of a brother; another said in favour of a cousin or a near relation. But his lordship would ask, what had the condition or relationship of the person in whose favour the bond was made to do with the question? That ought to be left out of consideration. Could a patron take a bond in favour of himself? If not, he could not make it in favour of any man on account of relationship, for no man is more nearly related to a patron than

himself; and if he could make such a bond, it would in construction of law be the same as a general bond of resignation, for it was evident he could present whom he pleased after. But, again, it was said, that it could not be held simoniacial, unless it appeared that some benefit could be derived from it. Might not such a bond be made covertly, in consideration of money, in this manner—when the time for resignation arrived, the patron might say to the clergyman, "If you pay me a certain sum of money, I will allow you to hold your living longer,"—could not such a thing be easily effected? His lordship had no doubt but that this decision would come by surprise, and bear harshly on many patrons and clergymen; but he was not one of those who would hesitate to indemnify those who had hitherto committed themselves by such bonds, whether patrons or incumbents, provided that were done without touching on the general principles of the ecclesiastical laws of the country, some of which, it should be admitted, were too severe. On the grounds before mentioned, his lordship did not see how he could do otherwise than adjudicate this a simoniacial contract. Now, after the most profound consideration, he would move their lordships that the judgment in the court below be reversed.

The Archbishop of Canterbury entirely concurred in the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, which was agreeable to that of the majority of the judges; but he had to implore their lordships' attention to this circumstance—that a large number, both of patrons and incumbents, had exposed themselves to severe penalties. But his Grace trusted that however erroneously they had thus committed themselves, that house would afford them protection. A patron was liable to a penalty of double the value of the living, and the forfeiture of the patronage for that time; and the incumbent was liable to double the value of the living, and to be disqualified from holding it. Such were the severe penalties they were innocently exposed to if not protected by that house. He held in his hand a bill containing such restrictions as would

protect bonds of this nature heretofore made, and exempt the parties from the penalties above alluded to: with their lordships' permission he would move that it should be now read *pro forma*,

and on the second reading he would explain its provisions.

The Lord Chancellor put the question, and the bill was accordingly read a first time.

LITERARY REPORT.

In the Press.—Three Courses of Lent Lectures, delivered in the Church of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate. By C. J. Blomfield, D. D. Lord Bishop of Chester, Rector of the Parish.

The Reasons of the Laws of Moses, from the More Nevochim of Maimonides, with Notes, Dissertations, and a Life of the Author, by James Townley, D. D., is announced.

Oriental Literature.—A fine edition of the curious and celebrated Indian drama

Sacontala, is about to appear in Paris, edited by M. de Chézy. It is to be accompanied by a French translation, which will enable persons ignorant of Sanscrit to form an idea of the Homeric genius of Indian literature. This edition has been undertaken at the expense of the Asiatic Society of Paris. Persian editions of Tabari, Ferdousi, &c., as well as editions of the principal Indian and Chinese Chronicles, are also about to be published at the expense of the French government.

TABLE OF CANDLELIGHT FOR JULY.

Day.	End Morning.		Begin Evening.		Day.	End Morning.		Begin Evening.		Day.	End Morning.		Begin Evening.							
	h.	m.	h.	m.		h.	m.	h.	m.		h.	m.	h.	m.						
1	3	—	3	9	—	3	11	3	—	13	8	—	57	22	3	—	30	8	—	42
2	3	—	4	9	—	3	12	3	—	15	8	—	55	23	3	—	32	8	—	40
3	3	—	5	9	—	3	13	3	—	16	8	—	54	24	3	—	33	8	—	39
4	3	—	6	9	—	2	14	3	—	17	8	—	53	25	3	—	34	8	—	38
5	3	—	7	9	—	2	15	3	—	18	8	—	52	26	3	—	36	8	—	36
6	3	—	8	9	—	0	16	3	—	20	8	—	51	27	3	—	37	8	—	35
7	3	—	9	9	—	0	17	3	—	22	8	—	50	28	3	—	38	8	—	34
8	3	—	10	8	—	59	18	3	—	23	8	—	49	29	3	—	40	8	—	32
9	3	—	11	8	—	59	19	3	—	25	8	—	47	30	3	—	42	8	—	30
10	3	—	12	8	—	58	20	3	—	27	8	—	45	31	3	—	44	8	—	28
						21	3	—	28				4							

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Selections from the Spectator, 12mo. 5s. bds.—BELSHAM's Sermons, Vol. II. 8vo. 10s. 6d. bds.—Reports on Justice in the West Indies, 8vo. 14s. bds.—WINSLOW's Instructions for Holy Orders, 8vo. 6s. bds.—Essay on Saving Faith, 12mo. 4s. 6d. bds.—HAMPDEN on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, 8vo. 9s. 6d. bds.—MORELL's Elements of the History of Philosophy and Science, 8vo. 12s. bds.—RUSSELL's (Rev. Dr.) Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 8s. bds.—Rules for the Aged, 12mo. 6s. bds.—VENTOULLAC's French Classics, Part

XXII. XXIII. and XXIV. 3s. each, sewed.—PITMAN's Sermons, 2d edition, 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 1s. bds.—The Christian Poet edited by Montgomery, 12mo. 6s. bds.—PETTIGREW's Bibliotheca Sussexiana, 2 vols. imp. 8vo. 31. 13s. 6d. bds.—HOOKER's Muscologia Britannica, 8vo. plain, 17. 11s. 6d. coloured, 37. 3s. bds.—ROUILLOON's Mythologie, 18mo. 5s. 6d. hf.-bd.—ELLIS on the Earl of Clarendon, 8vo. 6s. 6d. bds.—Chronology of the Bible, in case, 4s.—DEALTRY's Sermons, 8vo. 10. 6d.—BUDD on Infant Baptism, 12mo. 6s. boards.—BINGHAM's Discourses, 8vo. 7s. 6d. bds.—

Immortality, or Annihilation, crown 8vo. 8s. 6d. bds.—O'DRISCOLL's History of Ireland, 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 4s. bds.—BURKE and LAWRENCE's Correspondence, 8vo. 8s. bds.—BELCHER's Scripture Narrative, Vol. II. 12mo. 4s. bds.—MANN on the Atonement, 12mo. 3s. bds.—HENDERSON's Biblical Criticism, 12mo. 4s. boards.—MARCH's Life of Christ, 12mo. 4s. boards.—BROWN's Ornithology, No. I. imp. 4to. 15.; atlas, 4to. 18s.—The Annual Peirage, 2 vols. 18mo. 16. French bds.—GRAFFLE's Prosodical Lexicon, 8vo. 6s. bds.—BROWN's Jew, 8vo. 5s. boards.—BATHER's Sermons, 8vo. 12s. boards.—

MEREWETHER on the Case between the Church and the Dissenters, 8vo. 6s. bds.—BRAY's Memoirs of Evelyn, 5 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s. bds.—AINGER's Sermon on Religious Education, 1s. 6d.—MUSGRAVE's Sermon on the Christian Ministry, 1s.—MOUNT, (C. M.) on the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, 3s.—WALTER's (Prof.) Sermon at Haileybury, 1s. 6d.—COPESTON's (J. Gaius) Sermon on Philosophy, 1s. 6d.—DAUBENY's (Archdeacon) Vindication of Bishop Bull, 8vo. 6s.—JACON's (E.) Address to English Protestants, 8vo. pp. 54.—POTT's (Archdeacon) Charge on Infant Baptism, 1s. 6d.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

CORN LAWS.—The new bill for the regulation of the importation of foreign corn has been lost for the present session. After having passed the House of Commons, and been twice read in the House of Lords, an amendment, moved by the Duke of Wellington, that foreign corn should be inadmissible until the price in the home market reached 66s. instead of 60s. per quarter, as at first proposed, has been carried by a majority of eleven against the cabinet: in consequence of this, the measure has been abandoned. To prevent any inconvenience which the country might feel from the rejection of the bill, it is understood

that another for the regulation of the averages, which was originally supplementary to the former, will be suffered to pass without opposition, and with an additional short bill adopting the principle of the lost one, as a temporary measure till after the next meeting of parliament.

THE BUDGET.—We cannot attempt to follow the Chancellor of the Exchequer through his statements within the compass of our narrow limits, but we will endeavour to give such an epitome of them, as shall present the real state of the finances of the country to our readers, as follows:

Estimated expenditure of 1827	£51,764,000
Sinking Fund	5,700,000
Total estimated expenditure, subject to certain repayments	57,464,000
Estimated income of the four preceding years	228,000,000
Do. of 1827	54,600,000
Expenditure of present and four preceding years	282,600,000
Expenditure of the same period, the repayments deducted	257,477,000
Balance applicable to the Sinking Fund	25,123,000

which for the same period of five years will amount to £28,500,000, and therefore a deficiency of about £3,000,000 remains to be provided for in the budget of the present year. To accomplish this, the minister recommends an additional issue of Exchequer bills to such amount (but which he has not yet stated) as may be necessary to meet the emergency, and which he very properly considers

as more eligible than funding any part of it.

STATE OF COMMERCE AND AGRICULTURE.—We have never been more pleasantly engaged in this department than at the present moment: the improved state of the manufacturing districts is of the most cheering description. The demand for goods of British fabric is great both at home and abroad; and it is gratifying to

learn, from authority on which the most perfect reliance may be placed, that in some districts not a loom remains unemployed, nor is there necessarily an idle person. The demand for shipping keeps pace with this improvement in the manufactures. Freights have considerably increased, particularly on the western side of the kingdom, whence manufactured goods are principally exported, and where they average about 20 per cent higher rates than on the eastern; but, from the nature of the shipping interest, this inequality cannot continue long. The state of agriculture is equally favourable to the prosperity of the country. The hay harvest, which is now very generally carried in the south, has proved remarkably good both in quantity and quality; and the present appearance of the crops of wheat throughout the corn counties wears a very cheering aspect, whilst there is an abundant promise of a productive year in the other species of grain and of potatoes.

THE PENINSULA.—Portugal still remains in a very unsettled state towards the frontiers, from the other side of which the rebels continue to receive encouragement and assistance. At the same time it is asserted by deserters, that the Spanish army of observation is so infected with a liberal spirit, that if the troops were certain of a friendly reception, they would almost, without exception, desert to Portugal. Certain it is, that General Sorsfield, the commander of the Spanish forces on the side of Portugal, has been ordered by his government to fall back from the frontier. Desertion is said to have occasioned this; as his troops deserted in large bodies: one of eighty privates repulsed and killed sixteen of a detachment sent in pursuit of them. The Infanta Regent of Portugal is said to be gradually recovering from her recent sickness, all apprehensions of a fatal termination being totally removed.

The administration of Portugal has been changed, and, with the exception of the Marquis des Torres, an entirely new one has been formed. The rebel Des Chaves, with some of his associates, have been compelled to with-

draw from Spain, and have arrived at Bayonne.

Eastern Europe and Persia, Russia and Austria, conjointly with England, are said to be urgently negotiating with Turkey in favour of Greece; and several military measures, adopted by the first of these powers, are asserted to be intended to support these negotiations. Without denying, though we are far from crediting these suppositions, we believe they will be found to be connected with the war between that empire and Persia. The success which attended the arms of the latter, during the last autumn, has given great alarm to the Court of St. Petersburg. The Russian General, Yermoloff, has been recalled; the army very powerfully reinforced, and the Petersburg Court Gazette states that it has advanced beyond Erivan. The particular manner in which it describes the precautions taken for the security of this army, sufficiently intimates the danger and difficulty of the service on which it is employed, or the anxiety of the Russian Cabinet to prevent any unfavourable anticipations on the part of the public.

GREECE.—The siege of the Acropolis of Athens continues to be pressed with vigour. Favourable terms of capitulation were obtained for the garrison, from the Seraskier Pacha, through the mediation of some French officers, but were unanimously refused by the Greeks, who expressed their determination to die in its defence rather than surrender it. The leaders of the Greek forces having, therefore, resolved to attempt some measure for its relief, they formed a plan of attacking the Turkish troops in their intrenchments, early in the month of May. For this purpose, a large detachment, under the command of Karaiskaki, was ordered to advance through Livadia to storm them on the land side, whilst another body, under the escort, but not the command, of Lord Cochrane, should approach by sea. Unfortunately the former fell in with a part of the Turkish forces on the 4th; an action ensued, trifling in every respect but one, the loss of the Greek commander, who fell at the first commencement of the affair. As no one appears to have

been provided to succeed to his authority, or prepared to pursue his plans, that detachment retired to Phalerus, where it remained on the 15th, under the command of General Church.

On the 6th, the naval expedition landed about three thousand men, who had scarcely completed their debarkation when they were attacked by a large body of Ottoman troops. The havoc which ensued was dreadful, not one thousand of the Greeks surviving the action. Lord Cochrane is said to have effected his escape only by swimming for his life; and two thousand five hundred pairs of ears are reported to have been sent to Constantinople in proof of the victory.

BOMBAY.—The appointment of Sir John Malcolm, K. C. B. to the government of this Presidency cannot fail to give very general satisfaction.

CENTRAL AMERICA.—The dissensions which have so long harassed this country continue to wage with great violence, and without any appearance of a speedy termination. The rapacity

with which several cities in the provinces of Nicaragua and Grenada have been plundered, shews the fury as well as the avarice of the contending parties. The devastations are already felt by the merchants in the sea-ports adjacent to these districts, who can no longer obtain those supplies, particularly of hides and indigo, which once formed such valuable articles of Mexican commerce.

THE RIVER PLATE.—The hostile parties on the banks of this river have been very actively engaged. The commander of the Buenos Ayrean troops, having so manœuvred as to render the cavalry of the Brazilians inefficient, on the 20th of March fell upon the infantry, routed them, and took all their baggage. The following day the Brazilian general renewed the battle, and having brought up his cavalry, repulsed the Buenos Ayreans and retook his baggage. The loss is reported to have been nearly equal on both sides, and the state of the war to remain unchanged.

UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

OXFORD.

Degrees conferred June 2.

M. A.

Audland, W. F. Tairdar of Queen's Coll.
Boyle, Hon. John, Christ Church.
Eden, Rob. Scholar of Corpus Christi Coll.
Farlam, Rev. John, Queen's College.
Hill, Rev. John Oakeley, Christ Church.
Jones, Rev. Thomas, Wadham College.
Menzies, John, Scholar of C. C. C.
Perkins, Rev. John, Christ Church.
Tuckfield, J. H. Hippisley, Oriel College.
Watts, Rev. Robert, Lincoln College.

B. A.

Bourne, D. M. Scholar of Worcester Coll.
Cartwright, Robert David, Queen's Coll.
Davison, Thomas W. Wadham College.
Flowers, Field, Scholar of Lincoln Coll.
Gould, John, Wadham College.
Horndon, David, Exeter College.
Jeune, Francis, Scholar of Pembroke Coll.
King, John George, Brasenose College.
Landon, George, Worcester College.
Leighton, Baldwin, Christ Church.
Leonard, Francis B. Wadham College.
Lethbridge, Ambrose Goddard, Christ Ch.

Maddock, Henry William, St. John's Coll.
Moore, T. Barrington Geary, Pemb. Coll.
Morgan, Frederick, St. John's College.
Nixon, Francis R. Fellow of St. John's Coll.
Nixon, Thomas, Lincoln College.
Parker, Samuel Hay, Pembroke College.
Plummer, Seth Burge, University Coll.
Pollard, Edward, St. Edmund Hall.
Pugh, Giles, Magdalen Hall.
Purton, William, Trinity College.
Ran, A. J. Oriel Coll. Grand Compounder.
Rowe, James John, Magdalen Hall.
Sewell, Wm. Postmaster of Merton Coll.
Trotman, Joseph, Worc. star College.

June 6.

D. C. L.

Barrington, Hon. Augustus, Fellow of All Souls' College, Grand Compounder.

B. D.

Cracrost, Rev. G. Fellow of Lincoln Coll.
M. A.

Bloxam, Rev. A. Scholar of Worcester Coll.
Calvert, John Mitcheson, Oriel College.
Cockerell, Rev. Henry, Trinity College.
Gabb, Rev. J. A. Jesus Coll. Grand Comp.

Griffith, Henry, Jesus College.
 Kekewich, George Granville, Exeter Coll.
 Knox, Rev. H. Carnegie, Magdalen Hall.
 Lathbury, Rev. Thomas, St. Edmund Hall.
 Maude, Thomas, University College.
 Medland, Thomas, Scholar of C. C. C.
 Messiter, Rev. Richard, Corpus Christi Coll.
 Morgan, Rev. Thomas, Jesus College.
 Pantin, Rev. Thomas Pinder, Queen's Coll.
 Pitman, Rev. Thomas, Wadham College,
 Grand Compounder.
 Price, Rev. C. P. Scholar of Pembroke Coll.
 Purbrick, Lewis, Christ Church.
 Sergison, Rev. William, Brasenose Coll.
 Templeman, Rev. Alex. Queen's Coll.
 Tuckfield, Rev. Charles Hippisley, Fellow
 of All Souls' Coll. Grand Compounder.

B. A.

Avery, John Symons, Magdalen Hall.
 Batchellor, Edward Wm. Christ Church.
 Brown, John, Exeter Coll. Grand Comp.
 Calvert, F. Student of Ch. Ch. Grand Comp.
 Collinson, Henry King, Queen's College.
 Davies, Charles Greenall, St. Mary's Hall.
 Dowdeswell, J.C. Student of Christ Church.
 Fanshawe, C. Demy of Magdalen College.
 Gother, Andrew William, St. John's Coll.
 Griffith, William, Jesus College.
 Holder, Caddell, Trin. Coll. Grand Comp.
 Hone, Richard Brinsley, Brasenose Coll.
 Lee, Philip Henry, Brasenose College.
 Lewis, Fuller Wenham, Christ Church.
 Lingard, Joshua, St. Mary Hall.
 Maude, J. Michel Scholar of Queen's Coll.
 Nouaille, Julius, Trinity College.
 Price, Uvedale T. Ch. Ch. Grand Comp.
 Ruddock, Edward Greville, Trinity Coll.
 Staunton, William, Magdalen College.
 Steade, Edward, Magdalen College.
 Talbot, Hon. J. C. Student of Christ Ch.
 Thorold, H. B. Trin. Coll. Grand Comp.
 Thoyts, M. G. Christ Ch. Grand Comp.
 Tolming, Thomas, Brasenose College.
 Towson, John, Magdalen Hall.
 Tyers, Thomas, New College.
 White, Stephen Morgan, Edmund Hall.
 Windus, John, Exeter College.

June 14.

D. D.

Fausset, Rev. Godfrey, Margaret Professor
 of Divinity, some time Fellow of Mag-
 dalen College, Grand Compounder.

M. D.

Clendinning, John, Magdalen Hall.

M. A.

Beavan, Rev. James, St. Edmund Hall.
 Currie, Rev. Horace Gore, Oriel College.
 Currie, Rev. James, University College.
 Evans, Rev. William, Trinity College.
 Harbin, Rev. Edward, Wadham College.
 Miller, Rev. F. Richard, Worcester Coll.
 Palmer, George Thomas, Brasenose Coll.
 Scott, Rev. James, Wadham College.

B. A.

Barker, Henry Raymond, Merton College.
 Carr, George, Merton College.
 Davies, Lewis Charles, Wadham College.
 Edwards, Thomas, Exeter College.
 Hughes, John, Brasenose College.
 Jackson, Richard, Scholar of Queen's Coll.
 Jacobson, Wm. Scholar of Lincoln Coll.
 Jones, John Wynne, Jesus College.
 Lilley, Samuel, Jesus College.
 Luney, Richard, Magdalen Hall.
 Mac Iver, William, Brasenose College.
 Platt, William, Brasenose College.
 Richardson, William, Exeter College.
 Sutcliffe, James, St. Edmund Hall.
 Turbitt, John H. Scholar of Worcester Coll.
 Ward, William, Worcester College.
 Weir, John George, Brasenose College.
 Whateley, John Clements, Worcester Coll.
 Williams, Edward, Pembroke College.
 Williams, St. George A. Jesus College.
 Wilshire, Wm. Wadham Coll. Grand Comp.
 Wilson, Daniel, Wadham College.
 Woodruff, James, Merton College.
 Woodruff, Thomas, St. John's College.
 Wray, Cecil, Brasenose College.
 Wynter, James Cecil, St. John's College.

June 21.

M. A.

Boucher, Rev. Barton, Balliol College.
 Bowen, George, Christ Church.
 Cary, Henry, Scholar of Worcester Coll.
 Falle, Rev. Edward, Scholar of Pemb. Coll.
 Ingham, J. University Coll. Grand Comp.
 Palling, Rev. Edward, Queen's College.
 Parker, Rev. J. Timothy, Queen's Coll.
 Passand, Rev. Henry John, St. Alban Hall.
 Round, Rev. Joseph Green, Balliol Coll.
 Troughton, Rev. James, Christ Church.
 Turner, Rev. Charles, Wadham College.
 Wakeman, Rev. E. Ward, Wadham Coll.
 Wareing, Rev. James Taylor, Exeter Coll.
 B. A.

Bourke, Sackville Gardiner, St. Mary Hall.
 Dudley, Thomas, Trinity College.
 Forbes, Hugh, St. Mary Hall.
 Hawkins, Robert, Scholar of Pemb. Coll.
 Hesketh, Charles, Trinity College.
 Meech, Wm. John, Fellow of New Coll.
 Pye, William, Student of Christ Church.
 Tunnard, T. St. Mary Hall, Grand Comp.

The University Prizes for this year
 have been adjudged to the following gen-
 tlemen:—

Latin Verses, "Mexicum" — Charles
 Wordsworth, Christ Church.

Latin Essay — "Lex apud Romanos

Agraria" — Wm. J. Blake, B.A. Christ Ch.

English Essay — "The Influence of the
 Crusades upon the Arts and Literature of
 Europe" — Frederick Oakely, B.A. late of
 Christ Church, now Fellow of Balliol Coll.

English Verse — "Pompeii" — Robert
 S. Hawker, Magdalen Hall.

The following subjects are proposed for the Chancellor's Prizes for the ensuing year: *viz.*

For Latin Verses—“*Machinae vi vaporis impulse.*”

For an English Essay—“*The domestic Virtues and Habits of the ancient Greeks and Romans compared with those of the more refined Nations of modern Europe.*”

For a Latin Essay—“*Unde evenit ut in artium liberalium studiis præstantissimus quisque apud singulas civitates eodem fere sæculo floruerit?*”

The first of the above subjects is intended for those gentlemen who, *on the day appointed for sending the exercises to the Registrar of the University*, shall not have exceeded *four* years, and the other two for such as shall have exceeded *four*, but not completed *seven* years, from the time of their matriculation.

Sir Roger Newdigate's Prize.—For the best composition in English verse, *not limited to fifty lines*, by any Undergraduate who, *on the day above specified*, shall not have exceeded *four* years from the time of his matriculation.

“Richard Cœur de Lion.”

Frederick James Parsons, M. A. Demy of Magdalen; John Williams, M.A. Student of Christ Church; and the Rev. John Mitchell Chapman, M. A. Fellow of Balliol College, are nominated Masters of the Schools for the ensuing year.

George Robert Michael Ward, B.A. and Scholar of Trinity College, is elected and admitted Probationary Fellow; Edward Turner Boyd Twisleton, Scholar, and Thomas Legh Claughton, Exhibitioner, of that Society.

The judges appointed to decide Dr. Ellerton's Theological Prize, established in 1825, have adjudged the prize this year to F. Oakley, B. A. Fellow of Balliol College. The subject is as follows: “What was the object of the Reformers in maintaining the following proposition, and by what arguments did they establish it?—“Holy Scripture is the only sure foundation of any article of faith.”—The subject for the ensuing year is—“The faith of the Apostles in the Divine Mission of our Saviour was not the result of weakness or delusion, but of reasonable conviction.”

Mr. Henry Wm. Maddock, B. A. of St. John's College, is admitted Probationary Fellow of Brasenose College.

Francis Jeune, B. A. of Pembroke College, is elected a Scholar of that Society, on the foundation of Sir John Bennet Lord Ossulstone.

VOL. IX. NO. VII.

The names of those candidates, who, at the close of the Public Examinations in Easter Term, were admitted by the Public Examiners into the three classes of *Literæ Humaniores* and *Discipline Mathematicæ et Physicæ* respectively, according to the alphabetical arrangements in each class prescribed by the statute, stand as follow:

In the First Class of Literæ Humaniores.

Head, Edmund Walker, Oriel College.
Jeune, Francis, Pembroke College.
Merivale, Herman, Trinity College.
Sewell, William, Merton College.
Williams, Charles, Jesus College.

In the Second Class of Literæ Humaniores.

Calvert, Frederick, Christ Church.
Cartwright, Robert, Queen's College.
Holmesdale, Viscount, Christ Church.
Jackson, Edward, Brasenose College.
Jacobson, William, Lincoln College.
Maddock, Henry William, St. John's Coll.
Newnham, Geo. Wm. Corpus Christi Coll.
Rew, William Andrew, St. John's College.
Reynolds, Henry, Jesus College.
Smith, Culling Eardley, Oriel College.
Underwood, Frederick Forbes, Christ Ch.

In the Third Class of Literæ Humaniores.

Buckerfield, F. Henchman, Magd. Hall.
Butterfield, Wm. St. Edmund Hall.
Carr, George, Merton College.
Davies, Charles Greenall, St. Mary Hall.
Griffith, Charles, Christ Church.
Hand, Thomas, Trinity College.
Hind, William, University College.
Hoskyns, Hungerford, Oriel College.
Hutton, Thomas Palmer, Magdalen Coll.
Lee, Philip Henry, Brasenose College.
Mac Iver, William, Brasenose College.
Nixon, Francis Russell, St. John's Coll.
Plummer, Seth Burge, University College.
Purton, William, Trinity College.
Sutcliffe, James, St. Edmund Hall.
Tyers, Thomas, New College.

John Wilson,

Joseph Dornford,

John Shuldharn,

Arthur Johnson,

James Thomas Round,

Wm. Beach Thomas,

Examiners.

In the First Class of Discip. Math. et Phys.

Calvert, Frederick, Christ Church.
Cartwright, Robert David, Queen's Coll.
Corfe, Joseph, Magdalen College.
Heurdley, Charles Abel, Corpus Christi Coll.
Hind, William, University College.
Reynolds, Henry, Jesus College.
Underwood, Fred. Forbes, Christ Church.

In the Second Class of Discip. Math. et Phys.

Priestman, John Smith, Queen's College.
Rew, William Andrew, St. John's College.

Tyers, Thomas, New College.
 Williams, Charles, Jesus College.
In the Third Class of Discip. Math. et Phys.
 Newnham, Geo. Wm. Corpus Christi Coll.
 Robert Walker,
 Augustus Page Saunders, } Examiners.
 Edward Field,
 The number of candidates who form the
 Fourth Class, but whose names are not
 published, amounts to 116.

CAMBRIDGE.

Degrees conferred May 30.

D. D.
 Lamb, John, Master of Corpus Christi Coll.
 B. D.
 Bushby, E. Fellow of St. John's College.
 M. A.
 Arnold, Charles, Fellow of Caius College.
 Bingham, Thomas, St. John's College.
 Ford, William, Magdalene College.
 Teeson, John, Clare Hall.
 Ward, Walter Mather, Emmanuel College.
 M. A. (*ad eundem.*)
 Wilberforce, R. I. Fell. of Oriel Coll. Oxon.
 B. C. L.
 Hesse, Frederick Legrew, Trinity Hall.
 B. M.
 Barham, Charles, Queen's College.
 B. A.
 Baynes, Haygarth, Queen's College.
 Beauchamp, James, Clare Hall.
 Botcherby, Robert Mann, St. John's Coll.
 Dymoke, John, Trinity College.
 Ellis, Robert Stevenson, St. Peter's Coll.
 Fortescue, Matthew, Queen's College.
 Hutchins, Rev. Geo. Corpus Christi Coll.
 Lucas, St. John Wells, Downing Coll. Comp.
 Nuttall, Jno, Parker, St. John's College.
 Purton, William Christopher, Sidney Coll.
 Smith, Abel, Christ College.
 Williams, Phineas, Magdalene Coll. Comp.
 Willan, Francis Miles, Christ College.

June 11.

B. D.
 Cantis, Rev. Mark, Fellow of Emmanuel.
 Coventry, Rev. George, Jesus College.
 Hughes, Rev. H. H. Fellow of St. John's.
 Lee, Rev. Samuel, Queen's Coll. Professor
 of Arabic.
 Rose, Rev. Hugh James, Trinity College.
 Temple, Rev. N. J. Fellow of Sidney Sussex.
 Twopeny, Rev. R. Fellow of St. John's.
 Waterfield, Rev. R. Fellow of Emmanuel.
 Wynyard, Rev. Montague J. Downing Coll.
 M. A.
 Pocklington, Rev. H. Sharpe, Christ Coll.
 B. M.
 Foster, John, St. John's College.
 B. A.
 Finch, Benjamin, Trinity College.
 Peel, Robert, Trinity College.

The Chancellor's Gold Medal for the
 best English Poem by a resident under-
 graduate, is adjudged to Chr. Wordsworth,
 of Trinity College, Subject—*The Druids.*

The Porson Prize (for the best transla-
 tion of a passage from Shakspere into
 Greek verse) is adjudged to John Words-
 worth, Scholar of Trinity College.

Subject—*As You Like It.* Act III.
 Scene 3. Beginning,

“But do not so: I have,” &c.

And ending,

“with truth and loyalty.”

Sir William Brown's Gold Medals are
 adjudged as follows:—

Greek Ode—W. Selwyn, St. John's Coll.
Latin Ode } Chr. Wordsworth, Trin. Coll.
Epigrams }

SUBJECTS:

Greek Ode—“Sanctius his animal . . .
 “Debet adhuc, et quod dominari in cetera
 posset:

“Natus Homo est.”—

Latin Ode—*Iphigenia in Aulide.*

Epigrams—Παθηματα, μαθηματα.

The Greek Ode, the Latin Ode, and the
 Epigrams, mentioned by the Vice-Chan-
 cellor as “having great merit, and to the
 authors of which permission is given to
 transcribe their exercises into the book con-
 taining the prize compositions,” were writ-
 ten severally by

Wordsworth, sen. Trinity College.

Selwyn, St. John's College.

Hankinson, Corpus Christi College.

The Members' Prizes of fifteen guineas
 each, to two Bachelors of Arts, for the en-
 couragement of Latin prose composition,
 are adjudged to Messrs. Richard William-
 son and W. M. Heald, of Trinity College.
 Subject—*Homerus.*

The Members' Prizes to Undergraduates
 are adjudged to E. H. Fitzherbert and
 T. W. Peile, of Trinity College. Subject—
 “*Gracia, ipsa ferum victorem cepit, et artes
 Intulit agresti Latio.*”

A Lay Fellowship in Downing College
 has become vacant, open to all Graduates
 in this University and the University of
 Oxford, in Arts, Physic, and Civil Law.
 The election will be on the 30th of October.

The following gentlemen are appointed
 Barnaby Lecturers for the year ensuing:
Mathematical—J. Packe, B. A. King's.
Philosophical—W. Heard Shelford, M. A.
 Emmanuel.

Rhetorical—G. Waddington, M. A. Trin.
Logical—Thomas Thorp, M. A. Trinity.

Hen. James Perry, M. A. of Jesus Coll.
 has been elected a Fellow of that Society.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

ARCHDEACONY OF BUCKINGHAM. — The Venerable the Archdeacon has visited the churches in the northern districts of the county, and given his directions, not only for a supply of the necessary furniture for their interior, but likewise for restoring them gradually to the original form of their architecture, so far as can be effected without laying too heavy burdens on the parishioners. Under these directions, the churchwardens are empowered to act independent of a vestry.

A new Church is about to be erected at Paddock, near Huddersfield.

The Lord Bishop of Durham intends visiting and confirming throughout his diocese in July and August.

ORDINATIONS.

<i>Bath and Wells</i> . April 15	<i>Lincoln</i>	June 10	<i>Norwich</i>	June 10
<i>Ely</i>	<i>Llandaff</i>	April 15	<i>Oxford</i>	June 10
<i>Hereford</i>	<i>London</i>	June 10	<i>Peterborough</i> ..	June 10
<i>Lichfield and Cov.</i> April 1			<i>Salisbury</i>	Mar. 25
Alpe, Philip, B. A. <i>Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Alt, Just Henry, M. A. <i>Catharine Hall, Cambridge</i>			D. <i>London</i>	
Alvis, John Sergeant, B. A. <i>Christ Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Andrew, Richard, M. A. <i>Trinity Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Antram, Richard, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>Ely</i>	
Applebee, Henry, M. A. <i>Trinity Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>London</i>	
Arney, Edward Francis, M. A. <i>Brasenose Coll. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Salisbury</i>	
Arnold, Thomas Kerchever, B. A. <i>Trinity Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Ely</i>	
Battiscombe, William, M. A. <i>Pembroke Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>London</i>	
Bawtree, Harvey, B. A. <i>Jesus Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Norwich</i>	
Benjafield, John Frederick, B. A. <i>Trinity Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>Norwich</i>	
Berners, Ralph, M. A. <i>Magdalen Coll. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Birrell, Alexander Peters, Literate for the Colonies			P. <i>London</i>	
Bloxam, Andrew, M. A. <i>Scholar of Worcester Coll. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Oxford</i>	
Bluett, Thomas Lovell, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Bath and Wells</i>	
Booth, John, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Booth, Philip, B. A. <i>Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Norwich</i>	
Bosanquet, G. Henry, B. A. <i>Magdalen Hall, Oxford</i>			D. <i>Salisbury</i>	
Bourne, Robert Burr, M. A. <i>Student of Ch. Ch. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Oxford</i>	
Bowen, Percival, B. A. <i>All Souls' Coll. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Bowerbank, Thomas, <i>St. John's Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Boys, Edward George, B. A. <i>Worcester Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>London</i>	
Bradford, John Edward, B. A. <i>Corpus Christi Coll. Camb.</i>			P. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Braham, William Spencer Harris, B. A. <i>Lincoln Coll. Oxford</i> ..			P. <i>Ely</i>	
Bridges, Brook George, B. A. <i>Oriel Coll. Oxford</i>			P. <i>Peterborough</i>	
Brooke, John, B. A. <i>Brasenose College, Oxford</i>			P. <i>Lichf. and Cov.</i>	
Brooks, George William, B. A. <i>Christ Church, Oxford</i>			P. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Brown, Alfred Nesbit, Literate for the Colonies			D. <i>London</i>	
Browne, James Caulfield, B. A. <i>St. John's Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Ely</i>	
Buck, John Parmeter, B. A. <i>Caius Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Bucke, Horatio Walpole, B. A. <i>Trinity Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Norwich</i>	
Burnaby, Frederick George, B. A. <i>Caius Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Calthorp, Henry, B. A. <i>Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Lichf. and Cov.</i>	
Calvert, Nicholson Robert, M. A. <i>St. John's Coll. Cambridge</i> ..			D. <i>London</i>	
Cape, Henry, B. A. <i>Caius Coll. Cambridge</i>			D. <i>Ely</i>	
Capel, Samuel Richard, B. A. <i>Wadham Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>Norwich</i>	
Carver, James, B. A. <i>Jesus Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Chilcott, William Francis, B. A. <i>St. John's Coll. Cambridge</i> ..			P. <i>Bath and Wells</i>	
Chenery, Walter, B. A. <i>Jesus Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Norwich</i>	
Churchill, William, B. A. <i>Worcester Coll. Oxford</i>			{ D. <i>Llandaff</i>	
Clark, Thomas, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Cambridge</i>			{ P. <i>Ely</i>	
Clark, William, B. A. <i>Magdalen Hall, Oxford</i>			P. <i>Lincoln</i>	
Clark, Thomas Foreman, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Cambridge</i>			P. <i>Bath and Wells</i>	
Clarke, William Thomas, B. A. <i>Queen's Coll. Oxford</i>			D. <i>Lichf. and Cov.</i>	
			P. <i>Lincoln</i>	

Clinton, Henry, B. A. Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge	P.	Norwich
Cobbold, Francis, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Coldham, George, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Coldwell, Thomas, Literate (from the Archbishop of York).....	D.	London
Collyer, Robert, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Cookesley, William Gifford, B. A. King's Coll. Cambridge.....	D.	Ely
Cooper, James, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Cottle, Hen. Wyatt, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge.....	P.	Salisbury
Cresswell, Oswald Joseph, M. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford ..	P.	Ely
Crewe, Henry Robert, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Currie, James, B. A. University Coll. Oxford	P.	London
Daubuz, John, B. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	D.	Bath and Wells
Davey, Thomas, Literate for the Colonies	P.	London
De la Cour, Charles, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Desbrisay, Thomas Henry William, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge	P.	London
Dewdney, Edmund, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Oxford
Dodsworth, John, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	P.	London
Donne, Stephen, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P.	Bath and Wells
Douglas, Philip William, M. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford	P.	Oxford
Downes, Robert, M. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P.	Ely
Dinston, J., B. A. Trinity Coll. Dublin (from the Abp. of York) ..	D.	London
Dunningham, John, B. A. St. Peter's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Duthie, Arch. Hamilton, M. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P.	Lincoln
Eden, Robert, M. A. Scholar of Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford ..	D.	Oxford
Edgell, Edgell, B. A. Curate of Rousham, Oxford.....	D.	London
Edison, John, B. A. Christ Coll. Cambridge	P.	London
Eyre, Daniel James, B. A. Oriel Coll. Oxford	P.	Salisbury
Farish, William Milner, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge ..	P.	Lincoln
Fearon, Daniel Rose, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Fernie, John, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	P.	Ely
Fielding, Allen, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge	P.	London
Fisher, John Hutton, M. A. Fellow of Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Fitzherbert, Thomas, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Ely
Fowle, Henry, B. A. University Coll. Oxford	P.	Salisbury
Fowler, Frederick Cook, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge	P.	Norwich
Frankish, David, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Franklin, John Fairfax, B. A. Clare Hall, Cambridge	D.	Norwich
Gardiner, William, B. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	D.	Bath and Wells
Gilbie, Charles, B. A. Queen's Coll. Oxford	D.	Peterborough
Gleadall, John William, M. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge	P.	Ely
Glyn, Carr John, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford	P.	Ely
Godmond, Christopher Francis, B. A. Queen's Coll. Oxford ..	D.	London
Gooch, Coppering Henry, M. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge	P.	Ely
Graham, John, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Ely
Grainger, John Cecil, B. A. Downing Coll. Cambridge	D.	Salisbury
Gray, William, Literate	P.	London
Grey, George Francis, M. A. Fellow of University Coll. Oxford	D.	Oxford
Hale, William, B. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford	D.	Llandaff
Hall, Thomas Grainger, M. A. Magdalene Coll. Cambridge.....	D.	Ely
Harbin, Edward, B. A. Wadham Coll. Oxford	P.	Bath and Wells
Harrison, Benjamin John, B. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford	P.	Oxford
Harrison, William Bagshaw, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge	P.	London
Hensley, Charles, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge	D.	Lincoln
Henslow, William Henry, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge.....	D.	London
Hervey, George Gayton, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge.....	D.	Lichf. and Cov.
Hesse, James Legrew, B. A. Trinity Coll. Oxford.....	D.	Ely
Hewitt, Richard, B. A. Queen's Coll. Oxford.....	P.	Norwich
Hill, John Oakley, M. A. Chaplain of Christ Church, Oxford ..	P.	Oxford
Hill, Richard Humfrey, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D.	Bath and Wells
Hitch, James Wortham, B. A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.....	P.	Norwich
Hopkins, Benjamin, B. A. St. Jhn's Coll. Cambridge	D.	London
Horn, Thomas, B. A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford	P.	Peterborough
Horndon, John, M. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	D.	Bath and Wells
Howard, William, S. C. L. New Coll. Oxford	D.	Hereford

Hoyle, James, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Halton, Thomas, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Hustwick, Robert, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	P. Lincoln
Hutchins, George, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge.....	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Ingram, Rowland, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Jackson, E. Dudley, S. C. L. Trinity Hall, Cambridge	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Jarrett, Wilfrid Lawson, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Jeans, George, B. A. Pembroke Coll. Oxford	P. London
Julian, John Page, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Kelly, Walter, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Kemphorne, John, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Bath and Wells
Kenyon, Bedford, M. A. St. Mary's Hall, Oxford	D. Bath and Wells
Kerr, James Burton, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
King, John Myers, M. A. Balliol Coll. Oxford	D. Norwich
King, Isaac, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford	D. Lincoln
Korch, Christian Lewis, Literate for the Colonies.....	P. London
La Trobe, John Antes, B. A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford	P. Ely
Landon, James, S. C. L. Worcester Coll. Oxford.....	D. Norwich
Lane, Thomas Leveson, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Hereford
Langley, John, M. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford	P. Salisbury
Latimer, Edward W. Forty, B. A. Lincoln Coll. Oxford	D. Oxford
Leach, Octavius, M. A. Scholar of Jesus Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Leatherdale, John, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Leman, Thomas Orgill, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	D. Llandaff
Levingstone, Charles, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Ley, Jacob, B. A. Student of Christ Church	D. Oxford
Linton, Henry, M. A. Demy of Magdalen, Oxford	P. Oxford
Litchfield, Isaac Smith, B. A. Trinity Coll. Oxford	P. Norwich
Lockhart, S. J. Ingram, B. A. Lincoln Coll. Oxford	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Longe, Henry Browne, B. A. Downing Coll. Cambridge.....	P. Norwich
Lowther, Ponsonby, late of Christ Coll. Cambridge.....	P. Norwich
Lucas, Charles, B. A. Trinity Hall, Cambridge	D. Norwich
Lucas, St. John Wells, B. A. Downing Coll. Cambridge.....	D. Lincoln
Luck, Charles, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge	P. London
Lutener, Thomas Bancroft, Jesus Coll. Cambridge.....	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Luxmoore, Henry, B. A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge	P. Norwich
Macdonald, Jacob, S. C. L. Magdalen Hall, Oxford	P. Salisbury
Macdonogh, Terence Michael, Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Llandaff
Maltby, William, B. A. Emmanuel Coll. Cambridge	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Massingberd, Hompesch, Downing Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Marcus, Lewis, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Marsden, John Howard, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge ..	D. Ely
Mathews, William, B. A. Chaplain of New Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Meakin, J. Alexander Devereil, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Miller, Francis Richard, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	D. London
Minchin, John Champneys, B. A. New Coll. Oxford	P. Hereford
Monnington, George, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	P. Hereford
Moore, Richard Greaves, B. A. Christ Coll. Cambridge.....	P. Lincoln
Myall, William, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge	D. Norwich
Nares, Edward Robert, B. A. Merton Coll. Oxford	D. London
Nesfield, Charles, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Ness, Edward Hawke, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge..	D. Llandaff
Newbolt, W. Robert, M. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford ..	P. Oxford
Nixon, Francis Russell, B. A. Fellow of St. John's, Coll. Oxford ..	D. Oxford
Oakes, Hervey Aston Adamson, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge ..	D. Norwich
Oldershaw, Henry, B. A. Brasenose Coll. Oxford	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Olive, John, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	D. Lincoln
Outram, Thomas Powys, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Lichf. and Cov.
Owen, Henry, Magdalene Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Parmenter, John Dent, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Parsons, Charles James, B. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford	D. Peterborough
Pattison, Edward, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Paul, Charles, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	P. Bath and Wells
Pearson, Arthur, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D. London

Perkins, John, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford	P. London
Phillott, James Russell, B. A. Demy of Magdalen, Oxford.....	P. Oxford
Pocklington, Henry Sharpe, Christ Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Pollard, Edward, B. A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford	D. Lincoln
Polwhele, William, B. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	P. Ely
Pooley, John H. B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Ely
Pountney, Humphrey, B. A. Queen's Coll. Oxford	P. Lichf. and Cov.
Powell, William Frederick, B. A. St. Peter's Coll. Cambridge	D. Hereford
Powley, William, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge	P. Salisbury
Price, Charles Parker, M. A. Scholar of Pembroke Coll. Oxford..	P. Oxford
Pritchard, Charles, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P. Lincoln
Pugh, Giles, B. A. Magdalen Coll. Oxford.....	D. Ely
Puilen, William, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Oxford
Furdon, Robert Anthony, B. A. Trinity Coll. Dublin	D. Norwich
Radcliffe, George, M. A. St. Mary Hall, Oxford.....	P. Salisbury
Rees, Rice, B. A. Scholar of Jesus Coll. Oxford.....	D. Oxford
Rees, Samuel, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Rendall, Philip Pinckney, B. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	P. Salisbury
Rennell, William Blackstone, M. A. King's Coll. Cambridge...	D. Ely
Richmond, Christopher George, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge ..	P. Lincoln
Ridsdale, G. W. Hughes, B. A. St. Peter's Coll. Cambridge...	D. Norwich
Roberson, William Henry Moncrieff, M. A. Lincoln Coll. Oxford	D. Lincoln
Robertson, Charles, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Rogers, Aaron, B. A. Jesus Coll. Oxford.....	D. Llandaff
Rogers, Robert Vashon, Literate	P. Lichf. and Cov.
Rowell, Evan Edward, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge ..	D. London
Rusby, Samuel Stones, M. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.....	D. Ely
Russell, Edmund, B. A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Ryland, W. Deane, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Llandaff
St. Quintin, George Darby, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P. Lichf. and Cov.
Sams, Barwick John, B. A. Christ Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Sandilands, Alfred John, Literate (from Bishop of Durham)...	D. Ely
Sankey, Richard, M. A. Scholar of Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford.	D. Oxford
Saunders, James, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge.....	D. Norwich
Sayers, Andrew, S. C. L. St. Mary Hall, Oxford	D. Peterborough
Schomberg, John Bathurst, B. A. Emmanuel Coll. Cambridge ..	P. Norwich
Scott, Edward Allcrett, B. A. Trinity Coll. Dublin	D. Norwich
Seckerson, Edward Barlow, Catharine Hall, Cambridge.....	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Shaw, John, B. A. Jesus College, Cambridge.....	P. Ely
Shew, Henry Edward, M. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	P. Salisbury
Short, Augustus, M. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford.....	P. Oxford
Simpson, Malyward, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Simpson, Robert William, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge ..	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Singleton, Joseph, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Small, H. Alexander, S. C. L. Downing Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Smith, Elijah, Literate for the Colonies	P. London
Smith, Frederick, B. A. St. Peter's Coll. Cambridge	P. Ely
Smith, Samuel, B. A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford	D. Oxford
Smith, Samuel, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Smith, Theyre, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	D. Lincoln
Stamer, William, B. A. Trinity Coll. Dublin	P. Norwich
Sterky, Frederick Alexander, M. A. Student of Ch. Ch. Oxford	P. Oxford
Stonehouse, Henry, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Salisbury
Tahourdin, William, B. A. New College, Oxford	D. Hereford
Taylor, Charles, B. A. Downing Coll. Cambridge	D. Lichf. and Cov.
Taylor, William Robert, B. A. Jesus Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Teddeman, R. P. Goldsworthy, M. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford ..	D. Salisbury
Tennant, Sanderson, M. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D. Ely
Thomas, Honoratus Leigh, M. A. Student of Ch. Ch. Oxford ..	P. Oxford
Thornes, William, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford	P. Hereford
Thornton, Watson Joseph, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Thurlow, Charles Augustus, B. A. Balliol Coll. Oxford	D. Norwich
Tighe, Hugh Usher, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Oxford	P. Salisbury
Tiptaft, William, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Bath and Wells

Trenchard, J. A. Craven, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Salisbury
Trueman, Edward, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	P. London
Tucker, William Hill, B. A. King's Coll. Cambridge	D. Ely
Tuckfield, R. C. Hippisley, M. A. Fellow of All Souls' Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Turner, W. Hamilton, M. A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge	P. Norwich
Twiss, W. Christopher, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	P. Lincoln
Twopeny, David, M. A. Oriel Coll. Oxford	P. London
Tyrell, Charles Tyssen, B. A. Oriel Coll. Oxford	D. London
Underwood, J. Hammer, M. A. Brasenose Coll. Oxford	P. Hereford
Valpy, Francis Edward Jackson, M. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Wall, Alexander Malcolm, M. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. Ely
Walford, Ellis, B. A. Corpus Christi Coll. Cambridge	P. Norwich
Walker, Robert, M. A. Chaplain of Wadham Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Wallace, James Lloyd, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Ward, Samuel Wilkes, B. A. Magdalene Coll. Cambridge	D. Ely
Warner, George H. Lee, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Warner, H. James Lee, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Warren, John Crabb, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Waters, Randle Jackson, B. A. Christ Coll. Cambridge	D. London
Wells, Gifford, B. A. Sidney Sussex Coll. Cambridge	P. Salisbury
Wells, John, B. A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford	D. Oxford
Whitaker, Robert Nowell, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	P. London
White, Francis, B. A. Trinity Coll. Cambridge	P. Peterborough
White, John, B. A. Queen's Coll. Cambridge	P. Lincoln
White, Stephen Morgan, St. Edmund Hall, Oxford	D. Bath and Wells
Williams, Thomas Prosser, B. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford	D. Hereford
Willis, Edw. B. A. Brasenose Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Willis, Robert, B. A. Caius Coll. Cambridge	D. Ely
Willoughby, Hugh, B. A. Exeter Coll. Oxford	P. Oxford
Windle, Henry, B. A. Worcester Coll. Oxford	D. Oxford
Wintour, Fitzgerald, B. A. Magdalene Coll. Cambridge	P. Ely
Wodehouse, Nathaniel, B. A. Merton Coll. Oxford	P. Norwich
Wollaston, Francis Hayles, B. A. Trinity Hall, Cambridge	P. London
Wymer, Edward, B. A. St. John's Coll. Cambridge	D. Norwich
Number Ordained since March 25	270
Number Ordained in the two preceding Quarters ..	431
Number Ordained in Nine Months ..	701

LIST OF PREFERMENTS.

Name.	Prefrement.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.
Baylay, W. F.	Prebend in the Cathedral Church of Rochester			The King
Bonney, Archd.	Deanery of Stamford			Bp. of Lincoln
Brooks, George W.	To be Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Leeds			
Elwin, T. Henry ..	East Barnet, R.	Herts.	London	The King
Fisher, William ..	To be Chaplain to the Duchess of Kent			
Goodenough, Dr.	Archdeaconry of Carlisle			The King
Glaister, William ..	To be Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Leeds			
Harries, John	Newcastle Emlyn, P. C. Carm.	St. David		Ch. to Kenarh
Hewitt, William ..	Ancroft, C.	Durham	Durham	D. & C. of Durham
Hildyard, William	To be Chaplain to the Lord Chancellor			
Hony, W. E.	Baverstock, R.	Wilts.	Sarum	{ Rector & Fellows of Exeter College
Horne, W.	Hotham, R	York	York	The King
Hughes, John	St. Michael, Aberystwith Card.	St. David's		{ Vicar of Llanba- darn-vawr
Jenkinson, Bishop....	Deanery of Durham			The King
King, Walker	Archdeaconry of Rochester			The King
Leach, John	Tweedmouth, C.		Northum. Durham	D. & C. of Durham
Leach, W. Crawley.	To be Minor Canon and Precentor of Ely Cath.			D. & C. of Ely
Levett, Walter	To be Sub Dean of York Cathedral			Archbp. of York
Lucas, Richard....	Edith Weston, R.	Rutland	Peterboro	Rev. Rd. Lucas
Matchett, J. Chase	Catton, V.	Norfolk	Norfolk	D. & C. of Norwich

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.
Price, David,.....	Llanfihangel Vechan, P.C. Brec.	St. David	Rev T. Watkins	
Renaud, G. Daniel.	§ Messingham, V. with § Botteford, V.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Bp. of Lincoln and Dean & Chap. alt.
Rudd, John,	Halbroughton Prebend in the Coll. Ch. of Southwell			Archbp. of York
Russell, John	Prebend in Canterbury Cathedral			The King
Seymour, J. Hobart,	Prebend of St. Margaret's, Leicester, in Line. Cath.			The King
Scholefield, Profess.	To be Official to the Archdeacon of Ely			
Symonds, Thomas..	To be Domestic Chaplain to Lord Colnbrook			
Todd, James.....	To be Domestic Chaplain to the Duke of Sussex			
Vernon, Leveson ..	To be Chancellor of the Church in York Cath.			Archbp. of York
Ward, Jas. Duff,	Kingston, R.	I. of Wight	Winch.	Edmund J. Glynn
Wellesley, Hon. G.R.	Prebend in the Cathedral of Durham			Bp. of Durham
Wigram, J. C.	To be Secretary to the National School Society.			

CLERGYMAN MARRIED.

Jenkin, Charles, Bye Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to Emily Martha, eldest daughter of William Walker, Esq. of Barton Hall.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Paroissien, George, M.A. Rector of West Hackney, Middlesex, and formerly of Pembroke College, Cambridge, aged 65. It is with feelings of deep regret, that we record the death of this exemplary and truly Christian pastor, of whom it may with justice be said, that he alway "went about doing good." His meek and unassuming deportment evinced, that he had learned with the Apostle, "in whatsoever state he was, therewith to be content." For thirty-six years did he labour as curate of the parish of Hackney—with a single eye to the glory of God, and the salvation of those committed to his care. In him a fervid, though unobtrusive piety was united to a devoted attachment to the duties of his sacred calling, and warm admiration of the discipline of our Established Church. His family will ever revere his memory, as an affectionate husband and loving parent: and whilst those with whom he was connected by various ties, deplore him as a sincere and faithful friend, his parishioners will lament in his death the loss of a pastor, who watched so anxiously over that portion of the flock of Christ, which the Great Shepherd had been pleased to entrust to his keeping.

Allix, Robert, Rector of Great Warley, Essex.

Anson, Charles, Archdeacon of Carlisle, and Rector of Lyng and Mauthby, Norfolk.

Beauchamp, William, thirty-two years Rector of Sampford-Courtenay, Devon.

Bragge, Henry, Rector of Gosforth, Cumberland, aged 49.

Cragg, J. Vicar of Owston-cum-Withcote, and of Cowbit near Spalding.

Deason, William, P. C. of Ayton, Yorkshire.

Gardiner, E. M.A. Rector of Tintern Parva, Monmouthshire.

Hartley, J. Vicar of Corringham, and P. C. of Stow, Lincolnshire.

Hindley, John Haddon, Chaplain of the Collegiate Church, Manchester.

Hoblyn, Richard, Rector of All Saints, Colchester.

Jones, John, Vicar of Llangunnor.

Kersterman, A. aged 65, Rector of Bermondsey, Surrey.

Loveday, Arthur, D.D. Fellow of Magd. Coll. Oxford, and Rector of Antingham St. Mary.

Noble, Mark, Rector of Barming, Kent.

Senhouse, George, Curate of Wellington.

Stoddart, J. Head Master of the Grammar School, and Curate of All Saints, Northampton.

Storr, William, Master of the Grammar School, Thetford, Norfolk.

Thurgar, Christopher, P. C. of Aldershot, Hants.

Tucker, Thomas, Rector of Kingsdon, Somerset.

Whitehead, Edward, B.D. Rector of Eastham and Hanley, Worcestershire.

Winfield, William, Vicar of Ramsey and Dovercourt-cum-Harwich.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"A Churchman," "A Poor Curate," "G." "C. J." and "H. R. B." are postponed. We are compelled also to postpone some articles intended for the Monthly Register; among others, the Report of the Newbury Committee.